

Regression Discontinuity Design with Spillovers

Eric Auerbach

Department of Economics

Northwestern University

eric.auerbach@northwestern.edu

Yong Cai

Becker Friedman Institute

University of Chicago

yongcai@uchicago.edu

Ahnaf Rafi

Department of Economics

Northwestern University

ahnafrafi@u.northwestern.edu

April 10, 2024

PRELIMINARY

Abstract

Researchers who estimate treatment effects using a regression discontinuity design (RDD) typically assume that there are no spillovers between the treated and control units. This may be unrealistic. We characterize the estimand of RDD in a setting where spillovers occur between units that are close in their values of the running variable. Under the assumption that spillovers are linear-in-means, we show that the estimand depends on the ratio of two terms: (1) the radius over which spillovers occur and (2) the choice of bandwidth used for the local linear regression. Specifically, RDD estimates direct treatment effect when radius is of larger order than the bandwidth, and total treatment effect when radius is of smaller order than the bandwidth. In the more realistic regime where radius is of similar order as the bandwidth, the RDD estimand is a mix of the above effects. To recover direct and spillover effects, we propose incorporating estimated spillover terms into local linear regression – the local analog of peer effects regression. We also clarify the settings under which the donut-hole RD is able to eliminate the effects of spillovers.

1 Introduction

Regression discontinuity design (RDD) is a popular method for causal inference and policy evaluation, particularly in settings where experimental manipulation is not possible. In

this framework, units receive treatment if their value of some continuous running variable exceeds a certain cut-off, and no treatment otherwise. Identification of treatment effect then follows when potential outcome functions are continuous around the cut off ([Hahn et al. 2001](#)). Relative to other quasi-experiment designs, RDD is considered to require milder assumptions ([Lee and Lemieux 2010](#)). In particular, random treatment assignment near the boundary does not need to be assumed, but instead arises as a consequence of agents' imperfect control of the running variable ([Lee 2008](#)). For these reasons, RDD has seen widespread use in empirical economics.

However, identification in the conventional RDD framework of [Hahn et al. \(2001\)](#) requires the Stable Unit of Treatment Values Assumption (SUTVA). That is, potential outcomes of a given unit needs to be independent of the treatment status of all other units. This assumption may not be realistic in the presence of spillovers. Following [Manski \(1993\)](#), we broadly classify spillovers as either exogenous or endogenous. Exogenous spillovers occur when the outcome of an agent depends directly on the treatment status of their neighbors. On the other hand, endogenous spillovers arise when outcome of an agent depends on the outcome of their neighbors. Because spillovers are plausible in many settings, it is important to understand their effects on the RDD.

For example, [Huber and Arceneaux \(2007\)](#), [Krasno and Green \(2008\)](#), as well as [Keele and Titiunik \(2015\)](#) among others, study the effect of political advertising on voter turnout by comparing households on different sides of media market boundaries. Here, households that are believed to be ex ante comparable, but are subject to different amount of political advertising as a result of their location, which are in turn determined by regional factors orthogonal to local political conditions. RDD is therefore valid in the conventional framework if we can rule out spillovers. However, it is plausible that households experience exogenous spillovers since those on the treated side of the boundary may discuss political messaging with friends on the control. Households may also experience endogenous spillovers if there is peer pressure to conform in voting behavior.

In this paper, we characterize the estimands of RDD in the presence of spillovers. To do so, we extend the framework of [Hahn et al. \(2001\)](#) to incorporate exogenous and endogenous spillovers that occur along the running variable. Specifically, the outcome of a given unit is

allowed to depend linearly on the mean treatment status as well as mean outcome of units with similar values of running variables – that is, their neighbors. When the running variable is geographical coordinates, this model captures interaction between units that are close in space. When the running variable is a characteristic such as the ability of a worker, it reflects the idea that workers of similar abilities compete in the same labor market.

In this setting, we make two main contributions. Firstly, we show that the estimand of RDD depends on the ratio of two terms: (1) the radius over which spillovers occur and (2) the bandwidth used for local linear regression. Specifically, RDD estimates direct treatment effect at the boundary when the radius is of larger order than the bandwidth. This is the effect on a unit at the boundary when we switch their treatment status from control to treatment. When radius is of smaller order than the bandwidth, RDD instead estimates total treatment effect, which is the effect on the unit at the boundary when we switch the treatment status of the entire population from control to treatment. In the more realistic regime where radius is of similar order as the bandwidth, the RDD estimand is a mixture of the above effects with no clear interpretation. For our second contribution, we therefore propose to recover direct and spillover effects in the intermediate regime by incorporating estimated spillover terms into local linear regression. We show that our method, which is essentially the local analog of peer effects regressions, leads to consistent estimators as well as valid inference. Along the way, we also discuss the estimands of the popular RD donut and highlight settings under which it recovers either direct or total treatment effects.

This paper contributes to the vast literature on RDD (see [Cattaneo and Titiunik 2022](#) for a recent review). Empirical researchers have long been concerned with spillovers in RDD, with papers such as [Jardim et al. \(2022\)](#) arguing against the use of spatial discontinuity design for policy evaluation. However, to our knowledge, prior theoretical work on this issue is limited to [Aronow et al. \(2017\)](#), which conducts their analysis under the local randomization framework of [Cattaneo et al. \(2015\)](#). Given exact random assignment in a neighborhood of the cut-off, [Aronow et al. \(2017\)](#) shows that RDD in the presence spillovers recovers a weighted average of direct treatment effects. It does not require the spillover structure to be known but instead assumes exact randomization, which implies that treatment assignment is orthogonal to the neighborhoods over which spillovers occur. Exact randomization does not

follow from the continuity framework of [Hahn et al. \(2001\)](#), which yields only approximate randomization (see related discussion in Section 3.2 of [Canay and Kamat 2018](#)). Under the continuity framework, when spillovers occur along the running variable, treatment assignment cannot be exactly orthogonal to these neighborhoods. Our result shows that the extent to which orthogonality obtains depends on the ratio of spillover radius to local linear regression bandwidth. In particular, approximate orthogonality holds when radius is of larger order than bandwidth, but not otherwise, necessitating alternative estimation procedures.

This paper joins a burgeoning body of work that considers violations of SUTVA under various research designs, such as experiments ([Hudgens and Halloran 2008](#); [Aronow and Samii 2017](#); [Sävje et al. 2021](#); [Hu et al. 2022](#); [Leung 2022](#); [Li and Wager 2022](#); [Auerbach and Tabord-Meehan 2023](#); [Gao and Ding 2023](#); [Vazquez-Bare 2023b](#)), differences-in-differences ([Clarke 2017](#); [Butts 2021](#); [Xu 2023](#)), synthetic control ([Cao and Dowd 2019](#)), instrumental variables ([Sobel 2006](#); [Vazquez-Bare 2023a](#)) and other observational settings ([Forastiere et al. 2020](#)). RDD poses unique challenges relative to these other settings because here, the identified parameters are local to the cut-off and estimation is nonparametric. Additionally, we consider endogenous spillovers, which has received relatively less attention in this literature, though exceptions include, in the experiment context, [Munro et al. \(2021\)](#); [Li et al. \(2023\)](#); [Munro \(2023\)](#). In the presence of endogenous spillovers, a unit’s outcome may depend on the treatment status of the entire population, even if spillovers is assumed to have a small radius. The interaction of this dependence with the discontinuity of the outcome function in the space of the running variable poses novel technical challenges that we address.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes our econometric framework. Section 3 characterizes the consistency properties of local linear regression in terms of the radius of spillovers and bandwidth for nonparametric estimation. Section 4 presents the local spillovers regression for estimating treatment effect under the main asymptotic regime of interest. Section 5 concludes. Proofs are contained in the Appendix.

The remainder of this paper uses the following notation. We write $A_n \gg B_n$ if $A_n/B_n \rightarrow \infty$, $A_n \approx B_n$ if $A_n/B_n \rightarrow c$ where $0 < c < \infty$, and $A_n \ll B_n$ if $A_n/B_n \rightarrow 0$. Let ι and $\mathbf{0}$ be the identity and the zero functions on $[-1, 1]$ respectively.

2 Econometric Framework

In this section, we introduce the econometric framework for studying RDD with spillovers. We focus on population-level quantities, deferring sampling and estimation to Section 3.

Consider a continuum of agents that are indexed by their coordinates $z \in \mathcal{Z} = [-1, 1]$. For convenience, we will assume that agents are uniformly distributed according to $F = \text{Uniform}(\mathcal{Z})$, so that their density with respect to the Lebesgue measure is $f(z) = \frac{1}{2}$.

We work in the usual potential outcomes framework with binary treatment, where the observed outcome at z satisfies

$$Y_d(z) = d(z)Y_d^+(z) + (1 - d(z))Y_d^-(z) .$$

Here, $d : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the treatment assignment function. $Y_d^+(z)$ and $Y_d^-(z)$ are the potential outcomes under treatment and control respectively. Because of the treatment assignment rule in RDD, defined below, we will denote quantities related to treatment with “+” and those related to control with “-”.

Potential outcomes are indexed by d because as a result of spillovers, they may depend on the entire treatment function. Let every agent z have the set of relevant neighbors $R(z) \subset \mathcal{Z}$ with measure $|R(z)|$. These are agents whose realized outcomes affect z . Let potential outcomes be defined as follows:

Assumption 1 (Potential Outcomes). *For a given treatment assignment function $d : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and neighborhood structure $R : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$, the potential outcome of agent z under treatment d is:*

$$\begin{aligned} Y_d^+(z) &= m^+(z) + \delta(z)\mu_d(z) + \gamma(z)\nu_d(z) \\ Y_d^-(z) &= m^-(z) + \delta(z)\mu_d(z) + \gamma(z)\nu_d(z) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_d(z) &= \frac{1}{|R(z)|} \int_{R(z)} Y_d(u) f(u) du \\ \nu_d(z) &= \frac{1}{|R(z)|} \int_{R(z)} d(u) f(u) du .\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, let $m^+(z)$ and $m^-(z)$ be Lipschitz continuous on $\mathcal{Z} = [-1, 1]$ with Lipschitz constant C . Let $\delta(z)$ be continuously differentiable with $|\frac{d\delta}{dz}| < C_\delta$, $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\delta(z)| \leq \bar{\delta}$, $\sup_{z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}} |\delta(z_1) - \delta(z_2)| \leq \bar{\delta}$, $\bar{\delta} < 1$. Finally, let $\gamma(z)$ be continuously differentiable with $|\frac{d\gamma}{dz}| < C_\gamma$.

Continuity of the conditional mean functions around the cut-off is the main identifying assumption in RDD. Standard RDD requires only that $m^+(z)$ and $m^-(z)$ are continuous at $z = 0$. However, due to spillovers, continuity of potential outcomes also requires Lipschitz continuity of the two functions around the boundaries of $R(0)$. For simplicity, we assume Lipschitz continuity on the entirety of \mathcal{Z} .

The above model contains two sources of spillovers, both of which are linear-in-means. The exogenous spillover term is $\gamma(z)\nu_d(z)$, where $\nu_d(z)$ is the mean treatment status of z 's neighbors, and $\gamma(z)$ is the effect of this term on z 's outcome. The endogenous spillover term is $\delta(z)\mu_d(z)$, where $\mu_d(z)$ is the mean outcome of z 's neighbors, and $\delta(z)$ is the effect of this term.

The continuity conditions on γ and δ are analogous to the continuity conditions on potential outcomes that are standard in RDD. To ensure that Y_d^+ and Y_d^- are well-defined, we require $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\delta(z)| < 1$, as well as for $\sup_{z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{Z}} |\delta(z_1) - \delta(z_2)| \leq 1$. This is standard in the peer effects literature, as is our requirement that spillovers are linear in means. Our model is more general than the standard peer effects model, since we allow the effects of spillovers, δ and γ , to vary with z .

The linear-in-means assumption is potentially restrictive. However, it is in fact stronger than necessary for our characterization of the estimands. The qualitative results in Section 3 does not require linearity in the effects of spillovers, and allows neighbors to have different weights in treated and control outcomes. The only requirement is that neighborhoods have

approximately bounded support. However, as will become clear in Section 4, the specific form of spillovers needs to be assumed in order to perform estimation in our preferred asymptotic regime. For ease of exposition, we therefore focus on the above model.

In the RDD setting, treatment is assigned as follows:

Assumption 2 (Discontinuous Treatment Assignment). $d(z) = \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}$.

The parameters of interest are:

Definition 1 (Treatment Effects).

- The direct treatment effect at $z = 0$ is

$$\tau_d := Y_d^+(0) - Y_d^-(0) = m^+(0) - m^-(0) .$$

- The total treatment effect at $z = 0$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{TOT}} &:= Y_{\iota}^+(0) - Y_{\mathbf{0}}^-(0) \\ &= m^+(0) - m^-(0) + \delta(0) (\mu_{\iota}(0) - \mu_{\mathbf{0}}(0)) + \gamma(0) . \end{aligned}$$

The direct treatment effect on a given agent is the effect of treatment on their outcomes, keeping the treatment assignment of all other agents unchanged. In principle, there is a direct treatment effect for each treatment assignment function d . In the RDD setting, it is natural to focus on agent at the cut-off, $z = 0$, and take $d(z) = \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}$. Note that given Assumption 1, agents experience the same amount of spillovers in both potential outcomes. They therefore cancel out so that $\tau_d = m^+(0) - m^-(0)$. In this model, direct treatment effect is therefore equal to local average treatment effect (local to the $z = 0$) in the standard set up with no spillovers.

With some abuse of notation, we will use d to denote the treatment assignment both when $z = 0$ is treated and when it is not. Note that changing the treatment status at $z = 0$ does not change $\mu_d(z)$ or $\nu_d(z)$ for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ since it is an infinitesimal change. In other words, a single agent does not exert any spillover on other agents. Direct treatment effects are therefore easy to define in that we can change the treatment status of an individual

while keeping the spillovers fixed. Nonetheless, there is a coherent notion of spillovers in this model: if two treatment functions d and d' differ on a set of positive measure, then $\mu_d(z)$ and $\nu_d(z)$ need not be equal to $\mu_{d'}(z)$ and $\nu_{d'}(z)$.

The total treatment effect on a given agent is the effect on their outcome when we switch the treatment status of the entire population from control to treatment. In our notation, the subscripts $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ denote treatment assignments in which everyone and no one is treated respectively. As before, we will focus on the agent at the cut-off, $z = 0$. With total treatment effect, we are evaluating potential outcomes under different treatment assignments so that spillovers no longer cancel out. We remark that $\nu_{\mathbf{1}}(z) = 1$ and $\nu_{\mathbf{0}}(z) = 0$ so that exogenous spillovers at $z = 0$ is $\gamma(0)$.

Finally, we will assume that the neighborhood on which spillovers occur has the following structure:

Assumption 3 (Spillover Neighborhood).

$$R_n(z) = \{u : |z - u| < r_n\} .$$

Under the above assumption, all neighbors within radius r_n of z affect it equally, while those beyond r_n exert no effect. This is a well-studied class of networks known as random geometric graphs (see e.g. [Penrose 2003](#)) and is a common model for studying spillovers and interference (see e.g. [Leung 2020](#)). We will consider various asymptotic regimes in which $r_n \rightarrow 0$ at different rates in order to understand how the RDD behaves as we allow a given agent to be influenced by more or fewer neighbors. As will become clear in [Section 3](#), the ratio of r_n to the bandwidth for local linear regression, h_n , turns out to be the key quantity in determining the estimand of RDD.

3 Local Linear Regression in the Presence of Spillovers

In the absence of spillovers, it is standard to estimate the average treatment effect local to the cut-off (or, equivalently, in our framework, τ_d) using local linear regression. In this section, we characterize the estimand of the local linear regression estimator in the presence

of spillovers. It turns out that the estimand exhibits a phase transition that depends on the ratio of r_n/h_n . In our preferred asymptotic regime, where $r_n \approx h_n$, the estimand has no clear interpretation. We propose a simple regression adjustment that recovers direct and total treatment effects in Section 4.

3.1 Sampling and Estimation

Consider the following sampling framework:

Assumption 4. *Suppose we observe the i.i.d. sample $\{(Y_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where $Z_i \sim F$,*

$$Y_i = Y_d(Z_i) + \varepsilon_i \quad , \quad E[\varepsilon_i|Z_i] = 0 \text{ and } E[\varepsilon_i^2|Z_i] \leq \bar{\sigma}^2$$

In sum, the data-generating operates as follows. A continuum of agents interact and their outcomes are determined by location specific factors as well as spillovers. The econometrician then samples locations randomly and observes location-specific outcomes, possibly with error. This is similar to the framework of [De Paula et al. \(2018\)](#).

Remark 1. In standard peer effects models, when i and j are friends, ε_j affects Y_i through endogenous spillovers. That does not happen in our model because spillovers occur in the population rather than between the sampled individuals. The latter is asymptotically equivalent to the former as long as each sampled individual has their number of neighbors going to infinity, i.e. if the network of spillovers is sufficiently dense. In our framework, this translates into the mild assumption that $r_n \gg \frac{1}{n}$ (in our leading case, $r_n \approx n^{-2/5}$).

The local linear regression estimator is:

Definition 2 (Local Linear Regression Estimator). Let K be a bounded second-order kernel so that $\int_{-1}^1 K(u)du = 1$ and $\int_{-1}^1 uK(u)du = 0$. Furthermore, assume that for all u , $0 \leq K(u) \leq \bar{K}$, and that $K(u) = 0$ if $u < -1$ or $u > 1$. Let h_n be a sequence of bandwidths such

that $h_n \rightarrow 0$ and $nh_n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, define

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\beta}_0^+, \hat{\beta}_1^+) &= \arg \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{Z_i \geq 0} K\left(\frac{Z_i}{h_n}\right) (Y_i - b_0 - b_1 Z_i)^2 \\ (\hat{\beta}_0^-, \hat{\beta}_1^-) &= \arg \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{Z_i < 0} K\left(\frac{Z_i}{h_n}\right) (Y_i - b_0 - b_1 Z_i)^2 \end{aligned}$$

The local linear estimator for RDD is $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}} := \hat{\beta}_0^+ - \hat{\beta}_0^-$.

Second order kernels are commonly used in local linear regression. For a discussion on the properties of higher order kernels, see e.g. [Wand and Jones \(1995\)](#). We additionally assume that K has finite support and is bounded and non-negative. As in the nonparametric regression literature, this set of assumptions simplify proofs but are not necessary for the results.

In the absence of spillovers, it is standard practice to estimate τ_d using $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}}$ (see e.g. [Hahn et al. 2001](#); [Cattaneo and Titiunik 2022](#)). In this setting, $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}}(0)$ is consistent for τ_d , though inference is complicated by the presence of an asymptotic bias of order h_n^2 . Various solutions are available for the problem of inference (see e.g. [Calonico et al. 2014](#); [Armstrong and Kolesár 2018](#)). The properties of RDD are therefore well-understood when there are no spillovers.

3.2 Estimands of RDD

What does $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}}$ estimate in the presence of spillovers? This is the content of the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold.*

- (a) *If $r_n \gg h_n$, then $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}} \xrightarrow{p} \tau_d$*
- (b) *If $r_n \ll h_n$, then $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}} \xrightarrow{p} \tau_{\text{TOT}}$*
- (c) *If $r_n \approx h_n$, then $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}} \xrightarrow{p} \tau_*$*

The above result shows that the estimand of RDD exhibits phase transition, with the phases depending on the ratio r_n to h_n . When $r_n \gg h_n$, RDD estimates direct treatment

effect. On the other hand, when $r_n \ll h_n$, RDD estimates total treatment effect. In the intermediate regime where $r_n \approx h_n$, it estimates a parameter τ_* , which is displayed in full in Equation (23). Generally speaking, τ_* may not have a clear interpretation. In particular, τ_* is not equal to either τ_d or τ_{TOT} unless either $\delta(0) = \gamma(0) = 0$ (i.e. no spillovers) or $\tau_d = \gamma(0) = 0$ (i.e. treatment has 0 effect), in which case $\tau_d = \tau_{TOT} = \tau_*$. It may be close to 0 even when τ_d and τ_{TOT} are large in magnitude – a common concern expressed by empirical papers regarding spillovers. Nonetheless, τ^* may be useful as a bound for τ_d and τ_{TOT} under more assumptions (see Corollary 1).

The above result is intuitive. The local linear regression estimator essentially treats units within the bandwidth as being comparable. If r_n is large relative to h_n , units in the bandwidth have neighborhoods which overlap almost completely. In other words, they experience similar spillovers. As such, units on different side of the cut-offs differ only in their treatment status and $\hat{\tau}_{RDD}$ estimates direct treatment effect. Conversely, when r_n is small relative to h_n , units to the left of the cut-off essentially only has control neighbors, while units to the right of the boundary only has treated neighbors. Comparing these units therefore reveals total treatment effect. When $r_n \approx h_n$, units on either side of the boundary differ in their neighborhoods even asymptotically. However, this difference does not become large enough for us to treat them as if they only have neighbors of the same treatment status as them. The estimand is therefore a complicated term that interpolates these two effects.

As Theorem 1 shows, our choice of asymptotic regime affects our interpretation of the estimand. This raises the question: which asymptotic regime should we use? Despite its relative complexity, we consider the $r_n \approx h_n$ regime to be the more realistic regime. In practice, spillovers occur over some radius that is a finite factor of the bandwidth. The regimes $r_n \gg h_n$ or $r_n \ll h_n$ are therefore simplifying approximations. In contrast, the regime $r_n \approx h_n$ leads to approximations in which the estimand of RDD depends explicitly on the ratio of r_n/h_n . That is, it leads to an approximation that preserves more features of the finite sample distribution. For this reason, $r_n \approx h_n$ is our preferred framework for analyzing RDD with spillovers. Nonetheless, considering the extreme cases is instructive: it reveals that RDD recovers an estimand that lies on the spectrum with direct and total treatment effects at either extreme. It also highlights the role of the term r_n/h_n in embedding

our assumptions about comparability of neighborhoods. The larger this term, the more comparable the neighborhoods, and the closer our estimand is to direct treatment effects. Vice versa for smaller values of r_n/h_n .

Our result is also useful for revisiting existing empirical analyses. For a given study with bandwidth h_n , researchers who are concerned about spillovers should consider plausible r_n in those settings. If the conjectured r_n is large relative to the h_n that was used, they can be fairly confident that the reported estimates are for direct treatment effect. On the other hand, if r_n is of similar magnitude to h_n , or if the researcher is interested in parameters other than the one incidental to the choice of h_n , they might consider applying the method in Section 4.

Finally, although τ_* is generally not equal to τ_d or τ_{TOT} , it may still be informative about these parameters:

Corollary 1. *Suppose $\text{sgn}(\gamma(0)) = \text{sgn}(\tau_d)$.*

- *If $\delta(0) > 0$, then $0 < \tau_d < \tau_* < \tau_{TOT}$ or $\tau_{TOT} < \tau_* < \tau_d < 0$.*
- *If $\delta(0) < 0$, then $0 < \tau_{TOT} < \tau_* < \tau_d$ or $\tau_d < \tau_* < \tau_{TOT} < 0$.*

The above corollary show that under the assumption that τ_d and $\gamma(0)$ have the same sign, τ_* is informative about the signs of τ_d and τ_{TOT} . Furthermore, if we are willing to assume the sign of $\delta(0)$, then τ_* is an informative bound for the magnitude of both parameters. These types of sign restrictions could be reasonable in many settings. For example, if we are considering regression on voter turnout, then $\delta(0) > 0$ implies that z is more likely to vote when their neighbors vote, which is in line with peer pressure to conform. The assumption that $\text{sgn}(\gamma(0)) = \text{sgn}(\tau_d)$ requires spillover effects to operate in the same way as direct treatment. In the voter turnout example, if a person is motivated by an ad to vote, then being told about an ad should also encourage a person to vote, which appears more plausible than the reverse.

Remark 2. Although the exact form of τ_* depends on the structure of the spillovers, changing assumptions about the functional form or the relative weights of neighbors will not qualitatively affect the results in Theorem 1. In particular (a) and (b) will continue to

hold as long as spillovers occur over approximately bounded neighborhood. Similarly, when $r_n \approx h_n$, the limit of the $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}}$ will be combination of terms with no clear interpretation.

Remark 3. When $r_n \ll h_n$,

$$\tau_{\text{TOT}} \rightarrow \frac{\tau_d + \gamma(0)}{1 - \delta(0)}.$$

In words, total treatment effect at the cut-off depends only on parameters local to the cut-off when radius is small. In other regimes, total treatment effect is not identified without further assumptions because it depends on $m^+(z)$, $m^-(z)$, $\gamma(z)$ and $\delta(z)$ at points far from the cut-off. This is because with endogenous spillovers, any location can influence the entire domain for moderately sized r_n .

Remark 4. Our result in case (a) resembles that of [Aronow et al. \(2017\)](#). Under a local randomization framework, treatment assignment is exactly orthogonal to the neighborhoods over which spillovers occur, so that RDD estimates direct treatment effect. The continuity framework of [Hahn et al. \(2001\)](#) yields only approximate randomization, so that exact orthogonality cannot hold. In this framework, our results show that approximate orthogonality obtains in the special case when $r_n \gg h_n$. More, the extent to which orthogonality holds depends on the comparability of neighborhoods between treated and control units, which is controlled by the ratio r_n/h_n .

Remark 5. Even when h_n/r_n is small, the usual inference method may fail when $r_n \rightarrow 0$. This happens because spillovers create an asymptotic bias term whose order is $\min\{1, \frac{h_n}{r_n}\}$, which may be larger than h_n^2 or even $1/\sqrt{nh_n}$. In these cases, bias correction would be necessary for obtaining non-degenerate asymptotic distributions.

3.3 Other Practical Implications

In the remainder of this section, we informally discuss findings that may be useful for empirical researchers. The first relates to the relative robustness of local linear regression relative to the simple Nadaraya-Watson regression. The second pertains to the use of donut designs to addressing spillovers. The third pertains to spillovers on variables other than the running variable.

3.3.1 Local Linear Regression vs Nadaraya-Watson

Local linear regression has traditionally been preferred over Nadaraya-Watson estimator (local constant regression) for RDD due to the former's smaller biases at the boundary. It turns out that the local linear regression could also be more robust to spillovers in the following sense. Under the linear-in-means model, suppose there are no endogenous spillovers ($\delta(0) = 0$), but there may be exogenous spillovers $\gamma(0) \neq 0$. Let the estimands of the local linear regression and Nadaraya-Watson estimators be τ_{LL} and τ_{NW} . Then, if $r_n \geq h_n$,

$$\tau_{LL} = \tau_d \quad \text{but} \quad \tau_{NW} \notin \{\tau_d, \tau_{TOT}\}.$$

Local linear regression is therefore more robust to exogenous spillovers in that it recovers a desired parameter while Nadaraya-Watson does not. This happens because when $r_n \geq h_n$, $\nu_d(x) = kx$ for some k . The exogenous spillovers are therefore absorbed into the linear term of local linear regression. In the presence of endogenous spillovers, neither method is consistent for τ_d or τ_{TOT} .

3.3.2 Donut-Hole RD

Given concerns about spillovers, folk wisdom suggests the use of donut-hole RD, in which observations close to the cut-off are excluded. To be precise, let $h_n^o > 0$ be such that $h_n^o < h_n$. Then donut-hole RD estimates $\hat{\beta}^+$ by local linear regression on observations for which $Z_i \in [h_n^o, h_n]$. Similarly for $\hat{\beta}^-$ and observations for which $Z_i \in [-h_n, -h_n^o]$. Let the estimand of RD donut be τ_o .

Under the linear-in-means model, suppose $h_n^o = r_n$. In other words, we exclude all observations that have neighbors on the other side of the cut-off. Suppose there are no endogenous spillovers ($\delta(0) = 0$). Then $\tau_o = \tau_{TOT}$. This is because once we exclude units in the donut hole $[-h_n^o, h_n^o]$, the remaining units only have neighbors who have the same treatment status as them.

However, suppose $\gamma(z) = \tilde{\gamma}(z)\mathbf{1}\{z \leq 0\}$. In other words, only control units experience spillovers based on how many of their neighbors are treated. This is reasonable, for example, in the case of information treatment, where information can diffuse from the treated to

control units but not vice versa. In this case if $h_n^o = r_n$ and $\delta(0) = 0$, then $\tau_o = \tau_d$.

Finally, we note that once $\delta(0) \neq 0$, donut-hole RDs do not recover τ_d or τ_{TOT} in either model. This is because loosely speaking, under endogenous spillovers, the outcome of a given unit is affected by all other units in the domain: a given unit z has outcomes that depends on the outcomes of $[z - r_n, z + r_n]$. In turn, the outcome for $z + r_n$ depends on the outcomes on $[z, z + 2r_n]$, and so on. As such, it is not possible to isolate units that are “contaminated” by spillovers via a donut design.

3.3.3 Spillover on Variables Other than the Running Variable

In our model, spillovers occur along neighborhoods defined by the running variable, although in principle, spillovers can occur along some other variable w . In this case, RDD estimates a weighted average of direct treatment effects as long as w and z are not perfectly correlated. To see this, suppose w and z have continuous joint density. Then for any bandwidth on z , we will find both treated and control units with the same values of w . Since these units have the same spillover neighborhoods, comparing them yields direct treatment effect for said w . RDD essentially makes many such comparisons, so that its estimand is the weighted average of direct treatment effects, with weights corresponding to the density of w at the cut-off.

4 Local Spillover Regression

In our preferred asymptotic regime where $r_n \approx h_n$, RDD recovers an estimand that interpolates τ_d and τ_{TOT} . In this Section 4.1, we provide a method to disentangle direct treatment effects from spillover to separately recover τ_d and τ_{TOT} . Our method requires users to specify the radius over which spillovers occurs. We discuss the selection of this parameter by cross validation in Section 4.2.

4.1 Estimation

Our idea is to simply to include estimates of $\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)$ into the local linear regression. When \mathcal{Z} is 1-dimensional, define define the following estimators for $\mu_d(Z_i)$:

Definition 3. For a given r_n , let

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{R}^+(Z_i) &= \{j \neq i : \max\{0, Z_i - r_n\} \leq Z_j \leq Z_i + r_n\} \\ \hat{R}^-(Z_i) &= \{j \neq i : Z_i - r_n \leq Z_j \leq \min\{Z_i + r_n, 0\}\}\end{aligned}$$

That is, $\hat{R}^+(Z_i)$ and $\hat{R}^-(Z_i)$ are the treated and control neighbors of Z_i respectively. Note that these sets can be empty. Then,

$$\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) = w^+(Z_i)\hat{\mu}_d^+(Z_i) + w^-(Z_i)\hat{\mu}_d^-(Z_i)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_d^+(Z_i) &= \frac{w^+(Z_i)}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \sum_{j \in \hat{R}^+(Z_i)} Y_j \quad , \quad \hat{\mu}_d^-(Z_i) = \frac{w^-(Z_i)}{|\hat{R}^-(Z_i)|} \sum_{j \in \hat{R}^-(Z_i)} Y_j \\ w^+(Z_i) &= \frac{1}{2r_n} |[Z_i - r_n, Z_i + r_n] \cap [0, \infty)| \quad , \quad w^-(Z_i) = 1 - w^+(Z_i) .\end{aligned}$$

and summation over empty set of indices is understood to be 0. Define $\hat{\mu}_d(0)$ analogously.

Our estimator for the spillover term is the average outcomes of all locations within radius r_n of i , excluding i itself. Note, however, that we treat the means of the treated and control neighbors separately. In principle, we could estimate $\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i)$ using a simple average over the entire neighborhood of Z_i . However, it turns out that separately estimating the treated and control means leads to more precise estimators of $\mu_d(Z_i)$. r_n is a tuning parameter to be chosen by the user. While r_n should in principle be chose by the researcher based on domain knowledge, we provide a simple cross-validation procedure for its choice in Section 4.2.

We propose to estimate τ_d as follows:

Definition 4 (Local Spillovers Regression Estimator). For a given kernel function K and

bandwidths h_n such that $h_n \rightarrow 0$ and $nh_n \rightarrow \infty$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\beta}^+ &= \arg \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^6} \sum_{Z_i \geq 0} K \left(\frac{Z_i}{h_n} \right) \left(Y_i - b_0 - b_1 Z_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. - b_2 (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) - b_3 Z_i (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - b_4 (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) - b_5 Z_i (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \right)^2 \\
\tilde{\beta}^- &= \arg \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^6} \sum_{Z_i < 0} K \left(\frac{Z_i}{h_n} \right) \left(Y_i - b_0 - b_1 Z_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. - b_2 (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) - b_3 Z_i (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - b_4 (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) - b_5 Z_i (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \right)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The local spillover regression estimator for τ_d is $\tilde{\tau}_d := \tilde{\beta}_0^+ - \tilde{\beta}_0^-$.

Also define

$$\beta^+ := \begin{pmatrix} m^+(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) \\ m_z^+(0) + \delta_z(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma_z(0)\nu_d(0) \\ \delta(0) \\ \delta_z(0) \\ \gamma(0) \\ \gamma_z(0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \beta^- := \begin{pmatrix} m^-(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) \\ m_z^-(0) + \delta_z(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma_z(0)\nu_d(0) \\ \delta(0) \\ \delta_z(0) \\ \gamma(0) \\ \gamma_z(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We also define the indices of $\tilde{\beta}^+, \tilde{\beta}^-, \beta^+$ and β^- to start at 0.

With the local spillovers regression, our goal is to estimate $\tau_d = \beta_1^+ - \beta_1^-$, $\delta(0) = \beta_3^+ = \beta_3^-$ and $\gamma(0) = \beta_5^+ = \beta_5^-$. Relative to the local linear regression, our method includes four additional terms. $\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)$ corresponds to the exogenous spillover terms, which depends only on r_n . $\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)$ is the endogenous spillover term which we estimate. The remaining two terms are the spillover terms augmented with Z_i . These terms are not necessary for consistent estimation. However, they help reduce the bias of our estimators to $O(h_n^2)$. Just as local linear regression is simple OLS applied to a small neighborhood, our method can be interpreted as the usual peer effects regression applied to a small neighborhood. We therefore term it the ‘‘local spillover regression’’. The next result shows that this is sufficient for achieving consistency in asymptotic regime with $r_n \approx h_n$.

Theorem 2. *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold. Suppose further that $r_n = \frac{1}{2}ch_n$, where $c < 2$, $\tau_d \neq 0$ and $h_n \gg n^{-1/4}$. Then $\tilde{\beta}^+ \xrightarrow{p} \beta^+$ and $\tilde{\beta}^- \xrightarrow{p} \beta^-$.*

The above theorem shows that the local spillover regression is consistent for the vectors β^+ and β^- in our preferred asymptotic regime when $r_n \approx h_n$. In particular, we can estimate

$$\tilde{\tau}_d = \tilde{\beta}_1^+ - \tilde{\beta}_1^- \xrightarrow{p} \tau_d .$$

Since we can consistently estimate $\delta(0)$ and $\gamma(0)$, we can also estimate τ_{TOT} as

$$\tilde{\tau}_{TOT} = \frac{\tilde{\tau}_d}{1 - \tilde{\delta}} \xrightarrow{p} \tau_{TOT} .$$

Recall that local linear regression is not consistent for either τ_d or τ_{TOT} in this regime. Including the appropriate spillover terms into local linear regression is a simple way to recover our target parameters. A necessary condition for consistency of local linear regression is that $h_n \gg n^{-1}$. We have assumed that $h_n \gg n^{-1/4}$ for analytical convenience. Although this condition can be relaxed, we do not consider it restrictive since optimal bandwidth in our setting – as in the case without spillovers – is $h_n \approx n^{-1/5}$.

Our results are also stated under the assumption that $c < 0$ and $\tau_d \neq 0$. When the first assumption fails, $\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)$ is collinear with Z_i so that $\gamma(0)$ is not identified. However, since researchers control the choice of h_n , we consider this assumption innocuous. When the second assumption fails, $\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)$ is close to the 0 vector. In these cases, it would not be possible to identify $\delta(0)$. Nonetheless, τ_d is identified and can be consistently estimated if we project out the collinear components. However, τ_{TOT} is not identified, unless $\gamma(0) = \tau_d = 0$, in which case $\tau_{TOT} = 0$.

4.2 Choice of r_n

In principle, researchers should choose r_n based on the knowledge of the application domain. For example, researchers studying spillovers in house prices might set r_n to be a quarter mile if they believe that to be the size of the reference neighborhood that real estate agents use when setting prices.

If researchers are unsure about r_n , they may be able to choose it via cross-validation. Let the fold number K be specified by the user. Partition the data set D into K equal-sized subsets D_1, \dots, D_K . Let $\tilde{\beta}^{+,k}(r_n)$ denote the estimators in Definition 4, computed on $D \setminus D_k$. Let

$$\text{MSE}_k^+(r_n) = \sum_{i \in D_k} K \left(\frac{Z_i}{h} \right) \left(Y_i - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & Z_i & \hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0) & Z_i(\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) & \nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0) & Z_i(\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\beta}^{+,k}(r_n) \right)^2$$

We can then choose $r_n^+ := \arg \min \text{MSE}_k^+(r_n)$. Similarly for r_n^- . While we do not provide a formal theory of cross-validation for choosing r_n , the procedure appears to perform well in practice.

5 Conclusion

Regression Discontinuity Design is a popular empirical strategy that allows researchers to obtain causal estimates of treatment effects. However, there may be settings in which researchers may be concerned about spillovers. We show that spillovers do not threaten the validity of the RDD when they operate on a radius that is much larger than the bandwidth used for local linear regression estimation. However, RDD may lead to inconsistent estimate when radius and bandwidth are of similar order. In this case, we propose that researchers include estimates of spillover terms in their local regressions. This simple method leads to consistent estimates of direct and indirect treatment effects.

References

- Armstrong, Timothy B and Michal Kolesár**, “Optimal inference in a class of regression models,” *Econometrica*, 2018, *86* (2), 655–683.
- Aronow, Peter M and Cyrus Samii**, “Estimating average causal effects under general interference, with application to a social network experiment,” 2017.
- , **Nicole E Basta, and M Elizabeth Halloran**, “The regression discontinuity design under interference: a local randomization-based approach,” *Observational Studies*, 2017, *3* (2), 129–133.
- Auerbach, Eric and Max Tabord-Meehan**, “The local approach to causal inference under network interference,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03810*, 2023.
- Butts, Kyle**, “Difference-in-differences estimation with spatial spillovers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03737*, 2021.
- Calonico, Sebastian, Matias D Cattaneo, and Rocio Titiunik**, “Robust nonparametric confidence intervals for regression-discontinuity designs,” *Econometrica*, 2014, *82* (6), 2295–2326.
- Canay, Ivan A and Vishal Kamat**, “Approximate permutation tests and induced order statistics in the regression discontinuity design,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2018, *85* (3), 1577–1608.
- Cao, Jianfei and Connor Dowd**, “Estimation and inference for synthetic control methods with spillover effects,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.07343*, 2019.
- Cattaneo, Matias D and Rocio Titiunik**, “Regression discontinuity designs,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 2022, *14*, 821–851.
- , **Brigham R Frandsen, and Rocio Titiunik**, “Randomization inference in the regression discontinuity design: An application to party advantages in the US Senate,” *Journal of Causal Inference*, 2015, *3* (1), 1–24.

- Clarke, Damian**, “Estimating difference-in-differences in the presence of spillovers,” 2017.
- Forastiere, Laura, Davide Del Prete, and Valerio Leone Sciabolazza**, “Causal inference on networks under continuous treatment interference,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13459*, 2020.
- Gao, Mengsi and Peng Ding**, “Causal inference in network experiments: regression-based analysis and design-based properties,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07476*, 2023.
- Hahn, Jinyong, Petra Todd, and Wilbert Van der Klaauw**, “Identification and estimation of treatment effects with a regression-discontinuity design,” *Econometrica*, 2001, *69* (1), 201–209.
- Hu, Yuchen, Shuangning Li, and Stefan Wager**, “Average direct and indirect causal effects under interference,” *Biometrika*, 2022, *109* (4), 1165–1172.
- Huber, Gregory A and Kevin Arceneaux**, “Identifying the persuasive effects of presidential advertising,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2007, *51* (4), 957–977.
- Hudgens, Michael G and M Elizabeth Halloran**, “Toward causal inference with interference,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2008, *103* (482), 832–842.
- Jardim, Ekaterina S, Mark C Long, Robert Plotnick, Emma van Inwegen, Jacob L Vigdor, and Hilary Wething**, “Boundary Discontinuity Methods and Policy Spillovers,” Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2022.
- Keele, Luke J and Rocio Titiunik**, “Geographic boundaries as regression discontinuities,” *Political Analysis*, 2015, *23* (1), 127–155.
- Krasno, Jonathan S and Donald P Green**, “Do televised presidential ads increase voter turnout? Evidence from a natural experiment,” *The Journal of Politics*, 2008, *70* (1), 245–261.
- Lee, David S**, “Randomized experiments from non-random selection in US House elections,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2008, *142* (2), 675–697.

- and **Thomas Lemieux**, “Regression discontinuity designs in economics,” *Journal of economic literature*, 2010, *48* (2), 281–355.
- Leung, Michael P**, “Treatment and spillover effects under network interference,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2020, *102* (2), 368–380.
- , “Causal inference under approximate neighborhood interference,” *Econometrica*, 2022, *90* (1), 267–293.
- Li, Shuangning and Stefan Wager**, “Random graph asymptotics for treatment effect estimation under network interference,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 2022, *50* (4), 2334–2358.
- , **Ramesh Johari, Xu Kuang, and Stefan Wager**, “Experimenting under stochastic congestion,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12093*, 2023.
- Manski, Charles F**, “Identification of endogenous social effects: The reflection problem,” *The review of economic studies*, 1993, *60* (3), 531–542.
- Munro, Evan**, “Efficient Estimation of Causal Effects under Interference through Designed Markets,” 2023.
- , **Stefan Wager, and Kuang Xu**, “Treatment effects in market equilibrium,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.11647*, 2021.
- Paula, Áureo De, Seth Richards-Shubik, and Elie Tamer**, “Identifying preferences in networks with bounded degree,” *Econometrica*, 2018, *86* (1), 263–288.
- Penrose, Mathew**, *Random geometric graphs*, Vol. 5, OUP Oxford, 2003.
- Sävje, Fredrik, Peter Aronow, and Michael Hudgens**, “Average treatment effects in the presence of unknown interference,” *Annals of statistics*, 2021, *49* (2), 673.
- Sobel, Michael E**, “What do randomized studies of housing mobility demonstrate? Causal inference in the face of interference,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2006, *101* (476), 1398–1407.

Vazquez-Bare, Gonzalo, “Causal spillover effects using instrumental variables,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2023, *118* (543), 1911–1922.

—, “Identification and estimation of spillover effects in randomized experiments,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2023, *237* (1), 105237.

Vershynin, Roman, *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, Vol. 47, Cambridge university press, 2018.

Wand, Matt P and M Chris Jones, *Kernel smoothing*, CRC press, 1995.

Xu, Ruonan, “Difference-in-Differences with Interference: A Finite Population Perspective,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.12003*, 2023.

Appendix

A Proofs

A.1 Preliminaries

The following definitions and results will be useful. In particular, Lemma 9 is the technical core of the results in Sections 3 and 4.

Definition 5. Let the spillover operator G_n be defined as

$$(G_n \circ f)(z) = \frac{\delta(z)}{|R_n(z)|} \int \mathbf{1}\{|u - z| < r_n\} f(z) \frac{1}{2} dz$$

where $|R_n(z)| = \int \mathbf{1}\{|u - z| < r_n\} \frac{1}{2} dz$.

Definition 6. For a function $g : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, let its sup-norm be denoted $\|g\| := \sup_{z \in [-1, 1]} |g(z)|$.

Let the “structural” and “reduced form” functions be, respectively,

Definition 7.

$$m(z) := \begin{cases} m^+(z) & \text{if } z \geq 0 \\ m^-(z) & \text{if } z < 0 \end{cases},$$
$$g_n(z) := ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m)(z).$$

It will also be useful to split $m(\cdot)$ into the part that is Lipschitz continuous and the part that is not:

Definition 8. Let $m(x) = m^c(x) + \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\tau_d$ where

$$m^c(z) = \begin{cases} m^+(z) - \tau_d & \text{if } z \geq 0 \\ m^-(z) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant C .

Definition 9. Let the difference in the spillover neighborhoods at xh_n and 0 be:

$$R^+(xh_n) := R(xh_n) \setminus R(0)$$

$$R^-(xh_n) := R(0) \setminus R(xh_n)$$

Definition 10. Let \tilde{d} be

$$\tilde{d}(a) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a \leq -1 \\ \frac{a+1}{2} & \text{if } -1 \leq a \leq 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } a \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

Observe that if $\delta(z) = 1$, $\tilde{d}(a/r_n) = (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(a)$.

Definition 11. Let G_∞ be the pointwise limit of G_n when $r_n \rightarrow 0$. That is,

$$(G_\infty \circ g)(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\delta(z)}{R_n(z)} \int_{R(z)} g(y) dy = \delta(z)g(z),$$

where the last equality follows from the Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem. Furthermore, let $g_\infty(z) = ((I - G_\infty)^{-1} \circ g)(z) = \frac{g(z)}{1 - \delta(z)}$.

Lemma 1. Suppose $\|f - g\| \leq \varepsilon$. Then $\|(G_n \circ f) - (G_n \circ g)\| \leq \bar{\delta}\varepsilon$. In particular, if $\|g(z)\| < \varepsilon$, then $\|G_n^k \circ g\| < \bar{\delta}^k \varepsilon$.

Lemma 2. Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, suppose $r_n \rightarrow 0$. Then, there exists a function λ such that for $a \neq 0$,

$$|((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_n) - \lambda(a)| \leq \frac{2C_\delta r_n}{a(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}},$$

where $\lambda(a) > 0$ if $\delta(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. Furthermore, if $\delta(0) \neq 0$, then

$$\left| \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \gamma(z) \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) (ar_n) - \frac{\gamma(0)}{\delta(0)} (\lambda(a) - \mathbf{1}\{a \geq 0\}) \right| \leq \frac{2C_\delta r_n}{a(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}} + \frac{C_\gamma \bar{\delta}}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \cdot ar_n.$$

If $\delta(0) = 0$, then

$$\left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \gamma(z) \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) (ar_n) = \gamma(ar_n) \tilde{d}(a) = \gamma(0) \tilde{d}(a) + O(r_n) .$$

In fact, we know more about the structure of $\lambda(a)$. Let G_* be operator that smooths over $f \in \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$:

$$(G_* \circ f)(z) = \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbf{1} \{|u - z| < 1\} f(z) \frac{1}{2} dz$$

Then $\lambda(a)$ is approximately $((I - \delta(0)G_*)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(a)$. Note that λ depends on δ , though this is suppressed in the notation. Given Lemma 2, define:

Definition 12. Let $\tilde{R}^+(x) = \left[\max \left\{ 1, \frac{2x}{c} - 1 \right\}, 1 + \frac{2x}{c} \right]$ and $\tilde{R}^-(x) = \left[-1, \min \left\{ 1, \frac{2x}{c} - 1 \right\} \right]$.

Define:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^+(x) &:= \frac{1}{|\tilde{R}^+(x)|} \int_{\tilde{R}^+(x)} \lambda(a) dF(a) \quad , \quad \lambda^-(x) := \frac{1}{|\tilde{R}^-(x)|} \int_{\tilde{R}^-(x)} \lambda(a) dF(a) \\ \tilde{\lambda}^+(x) &:= \lambda^+(x) - \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} \quad , \quad \tilde{\lambda}^-(x) := \lambda^-(x) - \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\} . \end{aligned}$$

And:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{p,q,s}^+ &:= \int_0^1 x^p (\lambda^+(x) - \lambda^-(x))^q K^s(x) ds \quad , \quad \Lambda_{p,q,s}^- := \int_{-1}^0 x^p (\lambda^+(-x) - \lambda^-(-x))^q K^s(x) ds \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_{p,q,s}^+ &:= \int_0^1 x^p (\tilde{\lambda}^+(x) - \lambda^-(x))^q K^s(x) ds \quad , \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_{p,q,s}^- := \int_{-1}^0 x^p (\tilde{\lambda}^+(-x) - \lambda^-(-x))^q K^s(x) ds \\ \Gamma_{p,q,s}^+ &:= \int_0^1 x^p \left(\tilde{d} \left(\frac{x}{c} \right) \right)^q K^s(x) ds \quad , \quad \Gamma_{p,q,s}^- := \int_{-1}^0 x^p \left(\tilde{d} \left(\frac{x}{c} \right) \right)^q K^s(x) ds . \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3. Suppose g is Lipschitz on $[-1, 1]$ with Lipschitz constant C and $\|g\| \leq M$. Then $(G_n \circ g)$ is Lipschitz on $[-1, 1]$ with Lipschitz constant $C_\delta \cdot M + \bar{\delta}C$. Moreover, $(I - G_n)^{-1} \circ g$ is Lipschitz on $[-1, 1]$ with Lipschitz constant

$$\frac{C_\delta \cdot M}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{C}{1 - \bar{\delta}} .$$

Lemma 4. Suppose g is an odd function. If $\delta(z)$ is an even function, then $(G_n \circ g)$ is an odd function.

Lemma 5. $g_n(z) = g_n^c(z) + \tau_d \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}$ where $g_n^c(z)$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant

$$\frac{C_\delta \cdot (1 + \bar{\delta})M}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{C}{1 - \bar{\delta}} + \frac{C\bar{\delta}}{2r_n(1 - \bar{\delta})}$$

Lemma 6. Let g be a Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant C and suppose $r_n \rightarrow 0$. Then:

$$\sup_{z \in [-1/2, 1/2]} \left| ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ g)(z) - ((I - G_\infty)^{-1} \circ g)(z) \right| \leq \frac{Cr_n}{2} \frac{\bar{\delta}}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2}.$$

Lemma 7. Let h_n be such that $h_n > Kr_n$. Let \tilde{G}_n be G_n except with $\delta(z)$ set to $\delta(0)$. Then for all $x \in [-h_n, h_n]$, we have that

$$(G_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) = \left(\tilde{G}_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} \right)(x) + \sum_{j=1}^k (G_n^{k-j} \circ R_j)(x)$$

where

$$\sup_{x \in [-h_n, h_n]} \left| (G_n^{k-j} \circ R_j)(x) \right| \leq 2\bar{\delta}^k C_\delta h_n.$$

Lemma 8. Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, suppose $r_n \rightarrow 0$. The following holds for all $\eta \in (0, 1)$:

$$\mu_d(0) = \frac{m^+(0) + m^-(0) + \gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^\eta}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \right).$$

Lemma 9. Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, the following approximations are uniform in $x \in [0, 1]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0) = \begin{cases} \frac{xh_n}{r_n} (g_1(r) - g_1(-r) + l_1(r) - l_1(-r) + o(1)) & \text{if } r_n = r \\ \frac{xh_n}{r_n} \cdot (\tau_d \cdot (\lambda(1) - \lambda(-1)) + \gamma(0) \cdot ((\lambda(1) - 1) - \lambda(-1)) + o(1)) & \text{if } \frac{h_n}{r_n} \rightarrow 0 \\ \min\left\{1, \frac{|x|}{c}\right\} \cdot (\tau_d \cdot (\lambda^+(x) - \lambda^-(x)) + \gamma(0) \cdot ((\lambda^+(x) - 1) - \lambda^-(x)) + o(1)) & \text{if } r_n = \frac{1}{2}ch_n \end{cases}.$$

If $r_n/h_n \rightarrow 0$, let w_n be such that $w_n/r_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $w_n/h_n \rightarrow 0$. Then for $x \in [w_n, 1]$,

$$\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0) = \frac{\tau_d + \gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + O\left(h_n + \bar{\delta}^{w_n/r_n}\right).$$

The same statements hold for $x \in [-1, 0]$ *mutatis mutandis*.

Finally, we define the (mixed) incomplete moments:

Definition 13 (Incomplete Moments). The incomplete moment of order p at 0 is

$$\gamma_{p,s} := \int_0^1 x^p K^s(x) dx$$

and the incomplete mixed moment of order p at 0 is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(p, q, r, s) := \int_0^1 x^p \left(\min \left\{ \frac{x}{c}, 1 \right\} \left(\tau_d \cdot (\lambda^+(x) - \lambda^-(x)) + \gamma(0) \cdot ((\lambda^+(x) - 1) - \lambda^-(x)) \right) \right)^q \\ \cdot \left(\min \left\{ \frac{x}{c}, \frac{1}{2} \right\} \right)^r K^s(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

Incomplete moments are standard objects in the analysis of local polynomial regressions at the boundary (see e.g. [Wand and Jones \(1995\)](#)). The incomplete mixed moment is so named since also includes terms that arise from the approximations of $\mu_d(Z_i)$ and $\nu_d(Z_i)$ around the cut-off. We suppress the dependence of ϕ on c for convenience.

A.2 Proof of Lemmas

A.2.1 Proof of Lemma 1

For any $z \in [-1, 1]$,

$$|(G_n \circ f)(z) - (G_n \circ g)(z)| \leq \frac{|\delta(z)|}{|R(z)|} \int_{R(z)} |f(x) - g(x)| dz \leq \bar{\delta}\varepsilon .$$

Letting $g = \mathbf{0}$ and the bound for G_n^k follows by induction. □

A.2.2 Proof of Lemma 2

We will prove that the sequence $((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1} \{ar_n\})_{n=1}^\infty$ is Cauchy. Let m, n be given, where $m > n$. We consider the Neumann series: Writing $(I - G_n)^{-1}$ in terms of its Neumann

series:

$$(I - G_n)^{-1} = I + G_n + G_n^2 + \dots$$

First observe that for all a such that $|a| < 1/r_n$, we have that

$$\mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}(ar_n) = \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}(ar_m).$$

Next, suppose $\delta = 1$ is a constant function. Then,

$$(G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_n) = (G_m \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_m)$$

for all a such that $|a| < 1/r_n$. This is because the average of $G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}$ in the r_n neighborhood is around ar_n is exactly the average of $G_m \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}$ in the r_m neighborhood is around ar_m . This is true also for all a such that $|a| < 1/r_n - 1$. This is because our last result established equality on $[1, 1]$, and this guarantees equality of the local averages on $[-1 + r_n, 1 - r_n]$.

Now suppose $\delta(x)$ is changing. We can write

$$(G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_n) = (G_m \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_m) + R_1$$

where $\|R_1\| \leq |\delta(ar_n) - \delta(ar_m)| \leq C_\delta |a|(r_n + r_m)$ by Lemma 1.

Suppose for induction that for $|a| < 1/r_n - k$,

$$(G_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_n) = (G_m^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_m) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} G_n^j R_{k-j}$$

where $\|R_k\| \leq C_\delta |a|(r_n + r_m)$ for all k . Now,

$$(G_n^{k+1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_n) = G_n \circ (G_m^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_m) + G_n \circ \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} G_n^j R_{k-j}$$

for $|a| < 1/r_n - (k + 1)$. Now for a fixed a^* , choose K such that $(K + |a|)r_n \leq 1$. Then we

have that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| (I - G_n)^{-1} \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} (a^* r_n) - (I - G_m)^{-1} \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} (a^* r_m) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (G_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) (a^* r_n) - (G_m^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) (a^* r_m) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \sum_{j=0}^K (G_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) (a^* r_n) - (G_m^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) (a^* r_m) \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \sum_{j=K+1}^{\infty} (G_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) (a^* r_n) - (G_m^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) (a^* r_m) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} \|k G_n^j R_{k-j}\| + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{K+1}}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \\
&\leq \frac{C_\delta (r_n + r_m)}{a^* (1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n - |a^*|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from our inductive arguments earlier as well as repeated application of Lemma 1. Applying Lemma 1 again, and rewriting $K = \lfloor 1 - 1/r_n - |a^*| \rfloor$ yields the final inequality. As such, the sequence is Cauchy for fixed a^* . The limit therefore exists with the final term above being the rate of convergence.

For the next part, first suppose $\delta(0) \neq 0$. Then, we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \gamma(z) \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) (a r_n) \\
&= \frac{\gamma(0)}{\delta(0)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) \right) (a r_n) \\
&\quad + \frac{\gamma(0)}{\delta(0)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ (\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) \right) (a r_n) + R
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$|R| \leq \frac{C_\delta (r_n + r_m)}{a^* (1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n - |a^*|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}.$$

This is because as before, the error arises solely from approximating $\delta(z)$ with $\delta(0)$ on the relevant part of the domain.

By the first part of this lemma,

$$\left| \frac{\gamma(0)}{\delta(0)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) \right) (ar_n) - \frac{\gamma(0)}{\delta(0)} (\lambda(a) - \mathbf{1}\{a \geq 0\}) \right| \leq \frac{2C_\delta r_n}{a(1-\bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n - |a|}}{1-\bar{\delta}}.$$

Next observe that

$$(\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_n) = (\gamma(ar_n) - \gamma(0)) \delta(ar_n) \tilde{d}(a)$$

where \tilde{d} is given in Definition 10.

As such,

$$|(\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_n)| \leq C_\gamma \bar{\delta} \cdot ar_n.$$

By the Neumann expansion and repeatedly applying Lemma 1 as above,

$$\left| (I - G_n)^{-1} \circ (\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(ar_n) \right| \leq \frac{C_\gamma \bar{\delta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \cdot ar_n$$

Finally, when $\delta(0) = 0$, $G_n = \mathbf{0}$ and the result follows immediately.

A.2.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Let $x, y \in [-1, 1]$ be given.

$$\begin{aligned} |(G_n \circ g)(x) - (G_n \circ g)(y)| &= \left| \frac{\delta(x)}{|R(x)|} \int_{R(x)} g(z) dz - \frac{\delta(y)}{|R(y)|} \int_{R(y)} g(z) dz \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{\delta(x)}{|R(x)|} \int_{R(x)} g(z) dz - \frac{\delta(y)}{|R(x)|} \int_{R(x)} g(z+x-y) dz \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\delta(x) - \delta(y)}{|R(x)|} \int_{R(x)} g(z) dz \right| + \left| \frac{\delta(y)}{|R(x)|} \int_{R(x)} g(z) - g(z+x-y) dz \right| \\ &\leq M \cdot C_\delta |x-y| + \bar{\delta} C |x-y| \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose for induction $(G_n^k \circ g)$ has Lipschitz constant $k\bar{\delta}^{k-1}C_\delta \cdot M + \bar{\delta}^k C$. We know

from the above that $(G_n^{k+1} \circ g)$ has Lipschitz constant

$$\bar{\delta}^k C_\delta \cdot M + \bar{\delta} (k \bar{\delta}^{k-1} C_\delta \cdot M + \bar{\delta}^k C) = (k+1) \bar{\delta}^k C_\delta \cdot M + \bar{\delta}^{k+1} C .$$

Writing $(I - G_n)^{-1}$ in terms of its Neumann series:

$$(I - G_n)^{-1} = I + G_n + G_n^2 + \dots$$

gives us that

$$\begin{aligned} & |((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ g)(x) - ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ g)(y)| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |(G_n^k \circ g)(x) - (G_n^k \circ g)(y)| \\ & \leq |x - y| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \bar{\delta}^{k-1} C_\delta \cdot M + \bar{\delta}^k C \\ & \leq |x - y| \cdot \left(\frac{C_\delta \cdot M}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{C}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

□

A.2.4 Proof of Lemma 4

Suppose $R(z) = [z - a, z + b]$. Then $R(-z) = [-z - b, -z + a]$. Since, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (G_n \circ g)(z) &= \frac{\delta(z)}{|R(z)|} \int_{z-a}^{z+b} g(x) dF(x) \\ &= -\frac{\delta(-z)}{|R(-z)|} \int_{-z+a}^{-z-b} g(-y) dF(y) \text{ by change of variable: } y = -x \\ &= -\frac{\delta(-z)}{|R(-z)|} \int_{-z-b}^{-z+a} g(y) dF(y) \text{ since } g(z) = -g(-z) \\ &= (G_n \circ g)(-z) \end{aligned}$$

□

A.2.5 Proof of Lemma 5

Using Definition 8, write

$$g_n(z) = ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c)(z) + ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\tau_d)(z)$$

From Lemma 3, $((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c)(z)$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant

$$\frac{C_\delta \cdot M}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{C}{1 - \bar{\delta}}.$$

Next, by the Neumann expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\tau_d)(z) &= \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\tau_d + (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\tau_d)(z) + (G_n^2 \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\tau_d)(z) + \dots \\ &= \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\tau_d + ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\tau_d))(z) \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that $(G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant $\bar{\delta}/2r_n$.

We are done after applying Lemma 3 again. \square

A.2.6 Proof of Lemma 6

In this proof only, let m^c be any Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz constant C .

By Lipschitz continuity, no point in the r_n neighborhood of z can be larger than $m^c(z) + Cr_n$.

Choose $z \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. Then,

$$(G_n \circ m^c)(z) \leq \delta(z) \left(m^c(z) + \frac{Cr_n}{2} \right).$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} (G_n^2 \circ m^c)(z) &\leq \delta(z) \left((G_n \circ m^c)(z) + \bar{\delta} \cdot \frac{Cr_n}{2} \right) \\ &\leq (\delta(z))^2 m^c(z) + \frac{Cr_n}{2} \cdot 2(\bar{\delta})^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the Lemma 3 and the second inequality follows from substituting in our bound for $(G_n \circ m^c)(z)$. By induction,

$$(G_n^k \circ m^c)(z) \leq (\delta(z))^k m^c(z) + \frac{Cr_n}{2} \cdot k (\bar{\delta})^k$$

This is true as long as for all $k \leq K := \lfloor 1/2r_n \rfloor$. Summing the terms in the Neumann expansion, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c)(z) - \frac{m^c(z)}{1 - \delta(z)} &\leq \frac{Cr_n}{2} \cdot \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} k \bar{\delta}^k + 2 \cdot \frac{\bar{\delta}^{K+1} \cdot M}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \\ &= \frac{Cr_n}{2} \cdot \frac{\bar{\delta}}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + 2 \cdot \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/2r_n} \cdot M}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \end{aligned}$$

where the second term above comes from bounding terms corresponding to $k \geq K + 1$. An analogous lower bound gives us that

$$\left| ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c)(z) - \frac{m^c(z)}{1 - \delta(z)} \right| \leq \frac{Cr_n}{2} \cdot \frac{\bar{\delta}}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + 2 \cdot \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/2r_n} \cdot M}{1 - \bar{\delta}}.$$

Note here that for $z \geq 0$,

$$\frac{m^c(z)}{1 - \delta(z)} = ((I - G_\infty)^{-1} \circ m^c)(z).$$

Putting the above together with a similar argument for $z < 0$ gives us that for $z \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$,

$$\left| ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c)(z) - ((I - G_\infty)^{-1} \circ m^c)(z) \right| \leq \frac{Cr_n}{2} \cdot \frac{\bar{\delta}}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2}.$$

In other words, $((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c)$ converges uniformly to $((I - G_\infty)^{-1} \circ m^c)$ on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. \square

A.2.7 Proof of Lemma 7

The argument here is essentially the same as the inductive argument in Lemma 2. First note that for a given h_n , we have by Lipschitz continuity of $\delta(z)$ that for all $x \in [-2h_n, 2h_n]$, $|\delta(x) - \delta(0)| \leq 2C_\delta h_n$.

Next, observe that on $x \in [-2h_n + r_n, 2h_n - r_n]$

$$(G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) = \left(\tilde{G}_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\right)(x) + R_1(x)$$

where the requisite bound on R_1 holds by Lipschitz continuity of $\delta(z)$. We propagate this bound forward. On $x \in [-2h_n + 2r_n, 2h_n - 2r_n]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (G_n^2 \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) &= \left(G_n \circ \left(\tilde{G}_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\right)\right)(x) + (G_n \circ R_1)(x) \\ &= \left(\tilde{G}_n^2 \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\right)(x) + R_2(x) + (G_n \circ R_1)(x) . \end{aligned}$$

The bounds on $G_n^{k-j}R_j$ follows from Lemma 1. Note that the domain over which the property holds shrinks by r_n in each step of the induction. Since $h_n > Kr_n$, however, we can perform the above inductive step K times and still have the property hold for $[-h_n, h_n]$. Lemma 7 therefore follows.

A.2.8 Proof of Lemma 8

We decompose $\mu_d(0)$ into the parts corresponding to the structural function m and the exogenous spillover:

$$\mu_d(0) = A_n + B_n ,$$

where

$$A_n = \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} g_n(x) dF(x) \quad , \quad B_n = \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} l_n(x) dF(x) .$$

We start by evaluating the limit of A_n . Using Definition 8 write:

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &= \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((1 - G_n)^{-1} \circ m\right)(x) dF(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((1 - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^e\right)(x) dF(x) + \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((1 - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}\right)(x) dF(x) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6,

$$\frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} ((1 - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c)(x) dF(x) = \frac{m^-(0)}{1 - \delta(0)} + O(r_n)$$

For the second term in A_n , we use the Neumann series to write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} ((1 - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) dF(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \sum_{k=0}^K (G_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) dF(x) + \frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} (G_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) dF(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \sum_{k=0}^K (\tilde{G}_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) dF(x) + \frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1 - \bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} (G_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) dF(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \sum_{k=0}^K (\tilde{G}_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) dF(x) + \frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1 - \bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the first inequality above follows from Lemma 7 with h_n in the lemma set to $r_n^{1-\eta}/2$ and K set to $\lceil 1/r_n^\eta \rceil$. The second inequality follows from Lemma 1 and the definition of K . A similar argument leads to an analogous lower bound.

Now observe that $\mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} - \frac{1}{2}$ is an odd function. By repeated application of Lemma 4, we have that $\tilde{G}_n^k \circ (\mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} - \frac{1}{2})$ is an odd function. Since odd functions integrate to 0 on intervals symmetric around 0,

$$\frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \sum_{k=0}^K \left(\tilde{G}_n^k \circ (\mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) - \frac{1}{2} \right)(x) dF(x) = 0 .$$

In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \sum_{k=0}^K (\tilde{G}_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\})(x) dF(x) &= \frac{1}{2r_n} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \sum_{k=0}^K \left(\tilde{G}_n^k \circ \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I} \right)(x) dF(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^K (\delta(0))^k \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{I} is the identity function. The final equality above follows from the fact that $G_n \circ \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{I}$.

Conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &= \frac{m^-(0)}{1 - \delta(0)} + \frac{\tau_d}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1 - \delta^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right) \\ &= \frac{m^+(0) + m^-(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1 - \delta^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider B_n :

$$\begin{aligned} B_n &= \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \left(\gamma(z) \cdot \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) \right) (x) dF(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \left((\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} \right) \right) (x) dF(x) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \left((\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) \cdot \left(\mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} - \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) \right) \right) (x) dF(x) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \left(\gamma(0) \cdot \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) \right) (x) dF(x) \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $(\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant C_γ . As such, by Lemma 6,

$$\frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \left((\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} \right) \right) (x) dF(x) = O(r_n).$$

Furthermore, since $|\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)| \leq C_\gamma r_n$, we also have by Lemma 1 that

$$\frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \left((\gamma(z) - \gamma(0)) \cdot \left(\mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} - \tilde{d}(z) \right) \right) \right) (x) dF(x) = O(r_n)$$

Next, observe that when $\delta(0) \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) (x) dF(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{\delta(0)} \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}) \right) (x) dF(x) + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1-\bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\delta(0)} \left(\frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} \right) (x) dF(x) - \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\} dF(x) \right) \\
&\quad + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1-\bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\delta(0)} \left(\frac{1}{2(1-\delta(0))} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1-\bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2(1-\delta(0))} + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1-\bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality comes from approximating $\delta(z)$ with $\delta(0)$. The second to last equality above follows from the same arguments as in equations (2) and (3). When $\delta(0) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) (x) dF(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \left((I - \tilde{G}_n)^{-1} \circ \tilde{d}(z/r_n) \right) (x) dF(x) + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1-\bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{-r_n}^{r_n} \tilde{d}(x/r_n) dF(x) + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1-\bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1-\bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

As such,

$$B_n = \frac{\gamma(0)}{2(1-\delta(0))} + O\left(\frac{C_\delta r_n^{1-\eta}}{(1-\bar{\delta}^2)} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^{1/r_n^\eta}}{1-\bar{\delta}} \right).$$

□

A.2.9 Proof of Lemma 9

Write:

$$\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0) = A_n + B_n$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_n &= \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} g_n(z) dF(z) - \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{R_n(0)} g_n(z) dF(z) \\
&= \frac{|R_n^+(xh_n)|}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \cdot \frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} g_n(z) dF(z) \\
&\quad - \frac{|R_n^-(xh_n)|}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \cdot \frac{1}{|R_n^-(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^-(xh_n)} g_n(z) dF(z)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
B_n &= \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) - \frac{1}{|R_n(0)|} \int_{R_n(0)} l_n(z) dF(z) \\
&= \frac{|R_n^+(xh_n)|}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \cdot \frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) \\
&\quad - \frac{|R_n^-(xh_n)|}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \cdot \frac{1}{|R_n^-(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^-(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) .
\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$l_n(z) = [(I - G_n)^{-1} \circ (\gamma \cdot (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{u \geq 0\}))](z) .$$

A_n and B_n are the parts of μ_d coming from (1) the structural function m and (2) the exogenous spillover $\nu_d = G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\}$ respectively. We analyze these term by considering cases separately.

Case 1: $r_n = r$ constant

In this case, G_n , g_n and R_n do not change with n . Suppose first that $z \geq 0$. Then,

$$R_n^+(xh_n) = [r, r + xh_n] \quad , \quad R_n^-(xh_n) = [-r - xh_n, -r]$$

which shrink to r and $-r$ respectively.

We start with A_n . By Lemma 5,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} g_n(z) dF(z) &= \frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} g_n^c(z) dF(z) + \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} dF(z) \\
&\leq g_n^c(r) + \tilde{C}xh_n + \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} dF(z) \\
&= g_n^c(r) + \tilde{C}xh_n + \tau_d \\
&= g_n(r) + \tilde{C}xh_n
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality above follows from the fact that g_n^c is Lipschitz, with \tilde{C} being the relevant constant in Lemma 5. Together with a similar argument for the lower bound, we have that

$$\left| \frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} g_n(z) dF(z) - g_n(r) \right| \leq \tilde{C}xh_n$$

Furthermore, since $h_n/r_n \rightarrow 0$, we have that for n large enough,

$$\frac{|R_n^+(xh_n)|}{|R_n(xh_n)|} = \frac{|R_n^-(xh_n)|}{|R_n(xh_n)|} = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} . \tag{4}$$

Hence,

$$A_n = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} (g_n(r) - g_n(-r) + O(h_n)) .$$

where the constants in $O(h_n)$ do not depend on x . Now, if $z < 0$, a similar argument to the one above gives us

$$A_n = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} (g_n(-r) - g_n(r) + O(h_n)) .$$

Next consider B_n . By Lemma 3, $l_n(z)$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant

$$\tilde{C}_1 = \frac{C_\delta}{(1-\delta)^2} + \frac{C_\gamma}{1-\delta}$$

As such,

$$\frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) \leq l_n(r) + \tilde{C}_1 xh_n ,$$

with an analogous lower bound. We conclude that

$$B_n = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} (l_n(r) - l_n(-r) + O(h_n)) .$$

when $z \geq 0$ and

$$B_n = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} (l_n(-r) - l_n(r) + O(h_n)) .$$

when $z < 0$.

Case 2: $r_n \rightarrow 0, h_n/r_n \rightarrow 0$

Start with A_n . Suppose again that $z \geq 0$. Since $h_n/r_n \rightarrow 0$, equation (4) continues to hold.

Write:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} g_n(z) dF(z) &= \frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c \right) (z) dF(z) \\ &\quad + \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq 0\}} \right) (z) dF(z) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We start with first term above:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ m^c \right) (z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} \left((I - G_\infty)^{-1} \circ m^c \right) (z) dF(z) + O(r_n) \text{ by Lemma 6} \\ &= \frac{m^c(r_n)}{1 - \delta(r_n)} + O(h_n) + O(r_n) \text{ by Definition 11 and the fact that } m^c \text{ is Lipschitz} \\ &= \frac{m^c(0)}{1 - \delta(0)} + O(h_n) + O(r_n) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the last equality follows again from Lipschitz continuity of $m^c(z)$ and $\delta(z)$.

Next, consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\})(z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} \lambda(z/r_n) dF(z) + O\left(\frac{2\bar{\delta}^{\lfloor 1/r_n \rfloor - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

which follows by an application of Lemma 2 with $|a| = 2$ since $h_n \ll r_n$. Next consider the change of variable $a = z/r_n$. This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\})(z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{\tau_d}{r_n(xh_n/r_n)} \int_{[1, 1+2xh_n/r_n]} \lambda(a) \cdot r_n dF(a) + O\left(\frac{2\bar{\delta}^{\lfloor 1/r_n \rfloor - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right) \\ &= \frac{\tau_d}{xh_n/r_n} \int_{[1, 1+2xh_n/r_n]} \lambda(a) dF(a) + O\left(\frac{2\bar{\delta}^{\lfloor 1/r_n \rfloor - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right) \\ &= \tau_d \cdot \lambda(1) + o(1) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the last equality follows from the Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem. The domain of integration is a convex interval and trivially of bounded eccentricity.

Putting equations (6) and (7) together with equation (4) yields:

$$A_n = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} \cdot \tau_d \cdot (\lambda(1) - \lambda(-1) + o(1)) .$$

Finally, suppose $z < 0$. Note that analysis of the continuous part is identical. For the discontinuous part, the first term is now zero. The second term is expanded around $-r_n$, giving us

$$A_n = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} \cdot \tau_d \cdot (\lambda(-1) - \lambda(1) + o(1)) .$$

Next, consider B_n . Using the second part of Lemma 2, and identical argument to the one in equation (7) gives us that

$$\frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) = \gamma(0) \cdot (\lambda(1) - \mathbf{1}\{1 \geq 0\}) + o(1) \tag{8}$$

Consequently, if $z \geq 0$,

$$B_n = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} \cdot \gamma(0) \cdot ((\lambda(1) - 1) - \lambda(-1) + o(1)) .$$

On the other hand, if $z \leq 0$,

$$B_n = \frac{xh_n}{r_n} \cdot \gamma(0) \cdot (\lambda(-1) - (\lambda(1) - 1) + o(1)) .$$

Case 3: $r_n = \frac{1}{2}ch_n$

Under this asymptotic regime,

$$\frac{|R_n^+(xh_n)|}{|R_n(xh_n)|} = \frac{|R_n^-(xh_n)|}{|R_n(xh_n)|} = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|x|}{c} \right\} . \quad (9)$$

To see this, note that when $|x|h_n > 2r_n = ch_n$, there is no overlap between $R_n(xh_n)$ and $R_n(0)$. When $|x| < c$, the area of

$$R_n^+(xh_n) = R_n^-(xh_n) = (c - |x|)h_n$$

while $R_n(xh_n) = 2r_n = ch_n$, yielding the expression above.

Suppose again that $z \geq 0$. We consider the same decomposition as in equation (5). Equation (6) continues to be valid since we did not make any assumption about h_n/r_n in its derivation.

Now, by a change of variable $a = z/r_n$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\})(z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{\tau_d}{r_n |\tilde{R}(x)|} \int_{\tilde{R}(x)} \lambda(a) \cdot r_n dF(a) + O\left(\frac{2\bar{\delta}^{\lfloor 1/r_n \rfloor - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right) \\ &= \tau_d \cdot \lambda^+(x) + O\left(\frac{2\bar{\delta}^{\lfloor 1/r_n \rfloor - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

In first equality above, we applied Lemma 2 and the fact that

$$R_n^+(xh_n) = [\max\{r_n, xh_n - r_n\}, r_n + xh_n] = r_n \left[\max\left\{1, \frac{2x}{c} - 1\right\}, 1 + \frac{2x}{c} \right] = r_n \tilde{R}^+(x) .$$

Since $|x| \leq 1$, the above bound is uniform in x once we let $|a| = 1 + \frac{2}{c}$.

By the same reasoning,

$$R_n^- = r_n \underbrace{\left[-1, \min\left\{\frac{2x}{c} - 1, 1\right\} \right]}_{=: \tilde{R}^-(x)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n^-(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^-(xh_n)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\} \right) (z) dF(z) \\ &= \tau_d \cdot \lambda^-(x) + O\left(\frac{2\bar{\delta}^{\lfloor 1/r_n \rfloor - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Putting equations (6), (10) and (11) together with equation (9) yields:

$$A_n = \min\left\{1, \frac{|x|}{c}\right\} \cdot \tau_d \cdot (\lambda^+(x) - \lambda^-(x) + o(1)) .$$

A corresponding derivation for $x \leq 0$ yields

$$A_n = \min\left\{1, \frac{|x|}{c}\right\} \cdot \tau_d \cdot (\lambda^+(-x) - \lambda^-(-x) + o(1)) .$$

Next consider B_n . By derivations that is similar to (10), we have that

$$\frac{1}{|R_n^+(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n^+(xh_n)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\} \right) (z) dF(z) = \gamma(0) \cdot (\lambda^+(x) - \mathbf{1}\{x \geq 0\}) + O\left(\frac{2\bar{\delta}^{\lfloor 1/r_n \rfloor - |a|}}{1 - \bar{\delta}}\right)$$

which implies that

$$B_n = \min\left\{1, \frac{|x|}{c}\right\} \cdot \gamma(0) \cdot ((\lambda^+(x) - 1) - \lambda^-(x) + o(1)) .$$

when $z \geq 0$. When $z < 0$,

$$B_n = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|x|}{c} \right\} \cdot \gamma(0) \cdot (\lambda^+(-x) - (\lambda^-(-x) - 1) + o(1)) .$$

Case 4: $r_n/h_n \rightarrow 0$

Write

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_d(xh_n) &= \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} g_n^c(z) dF(z) \\ &\quad + \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\})(z) dF(z) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) \end{aligned}$$

As before, the limit of the first term above is given by Equation (6).

Next, for the second term, we apply Lemma 7, with h_n in the lemma set to bandwidth.

Next, let $K = \lfloor w_n/r_n \rfloor + 1$. Then, uniformly for $x \in [-1, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\tau_d}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} ((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\})(z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \tilde{G}_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\} \right) (z) dF(z) + O \left(\frac{C_\delta h_n}{(1 - \bar{\delta})^2} + \frac{\bar{\delta}^K}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for $|z| > Kr_n$, we have that

$$\left(\tilde{G}_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\} \right) (z) = \delta(0)^k \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} .$$

As such, for $x \in [w_n, 1]$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\tau_d}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \tilde{G}_n^k \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\} \right) (z) dF(z) \\ &= \tau_d \cdot \sum_{k=0}^K \delta(0)^k = \frac{\tau_d}{1 - \delta(0)} + O \left(\frac{\bar{\delta}^k}{1 - \bar{\delta}} \right) . \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

As such, the second term of $\mu_d(xh_n)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tau_d}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \left((I - G_n)^{-1} \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\} \right) (z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{\tau_d}{1 - \delta(0)} + O(\bar{\delta}^K) + O(h_n) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the third term in $\mu_d(xh_n)$. Applying Lemma 7 again, we have that when $\delta(0) \neq 0$, that for $x \in [-1, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta(0)} \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \left((I - \tilde{G}_n)^{-1} \circ (\gamma(y) \cdot (G_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\})) \right) (z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta(0)} \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \tilde{G}_n^k \circ (\gamma(y) \cdot (\tilde{G}_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\})) \right) (z) dF(z) + O(h_n + \bar{\delta}^K) \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta(0)} \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \tilde{G}_n^k \circ (\gamma(0) \cdot (\tilde{G}_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\})) \right) (z) dF(z) + O(h_n + \bar{\delta}^K) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows because for $k \leq h_n/r_n$, \tilde{G}_n^k evaluated on $[-h_n, h_n]$ does not depend on values of $\gamma(y)$ outside of $[-2h_n, 2h_n]$. The error from replacing $\gamma(y)$ with $\gamma(0)$ on this latter interval is $O(h_n)$ uniformly in $x \in [-1, 1]$. By the same reasoning, so is the error from replacing $\delta(y)$ with $\delta(0)$. Now, suppose $\delta(0) \neq 0$. Then write

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \tilde{G}_n^k \circ (\gamma(0) \cdot (\tilde{G}_n \circ \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\})) \right) (z) dF(z) \\ &= \frac{\gamma(0)}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K+1} \tilde{G}_n^k \mathbf{1}\{y \geq 0\} \right) (z) dF(z) \\ &= \gamma(0) \left(\frac{1}{1 - \delta(0)} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \mathbf{1}\{z \geq 0\} dF(z)}_{=1} \right) + O(\bar{\delta}^{K+1}) \\ &= \frac{\delta(0)\gamma(0)}{1 - \delta(0)} + O(\bar{\delta}^{K+1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last equality above follows from Equation (12). That is, when $\delta(0) \neq 0$,

$$\frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) = \frac{\gamma(0)}{1 - \delta(0)} + O(\bar{\delta}^{K+1})$$

uniformly for $x \in [w_n, 1]$. When $\delta(0) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} l_n(z) dF(z) &= \frac{1}{|R_n(xh_n)|} \int_{R_n(xh_n)} \gamma(z) \tilde{d}(z/r_n) dF(z) + O(h_n + \bar{\delta}^K) \\ &= \gamma(0) + O(h_n + \bar{\delta}^K) . \end{aligned}$$

again uniformly for $x \in [w_n, 1]$.

Putting our bounds together, we therefore have that

$$\mu_d(xh_n) = \frac{m^+(0) + \gamma(0)}{1 - \delta(0)} + O(h_n + \bar{\delta}^{w_n/r_n}) .$$

With Lemma 8, we then have that for $x \in [w_n, 1]$,

$$\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0) = \frac{\tau_d + \gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + O(h_n + \bar{\delta}^{w_n/r_n})$$

By a similar argument, when $x \in [-1, -w_n]$

$$\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0) = -\frac{\tau_d + \gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + O(h_n + \bar{\delta}^{w_n/r_n}) .$$

□

A.3 Proof of Theorem 1

We consider the regimes case-by-case. The proofs are similar across the cases except we use a different approximation for $\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0)$ depending on the regimes.

Case 1: $r_n \gg h_n$.

We first derive the bias for $\hat{\beta}^+$. A similar argument follows for $\hat{\beta}^-$. The two together yield the bias for $\hat{\tau}_d$. By Assumption 1 and the standard expansion:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_i &= m^+(Z_i) + \delta(Z_i)\mu_d(Z_i) + \gamma(Z_i)\nu_d(Z_i) + \varepsilon_i \\
&= m^+(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) + m_z^+(0) \cdot Z_i + \frac{1}{2}m_{zz}^+(0) \cdot Z_i^2 \\
&\quad + \delta(0)(\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) + \delta_z(0)Z_i\mu_d(Z_i) + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{zz}(0)Z_i^2\mu_d(Z_i) \\
&\quad + \gamma(0)(\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) + \gamma_z(0)Z_i\nu_d(Z_i) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{zz}(0)Z_i^2\nu_d(Z_i) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon_i + O(h_n^3)
\end{aligned}$$

In matrix form,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\hat{\beta}_0^+ \mid \mathbf{Z} \right] = e_1^T \left(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^T \mathbf{W} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \right)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{M}$$

where only observations with $Z_i \geq 0$ enter the following matrices:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & Z_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & Z_{n_+} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} m^+(Z_1) + \delta(Z_1)\mu_d(Z_1) + \gamma(Z_1)\nu_d(Z_1) \\ \vdots \\ m^+(Z_{n_+}) + \delta(Z_{n_+})\mu_d(Z_{n_+}) + \gamma(Z_{n_+})\nu_d(Z_{n_+}) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{W} = \text{diag} \left(K_h(Z_1) \cdots K_h(Z_{n_+}) \right).$$

As such, we can write

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\hat{\beta}_0^+ \mid \mathbf{Z} \right] = m^+(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) + A_n + B_n + R$$

where

$$A_n := \delta(0) \cdot e_1^T \left(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^T \mathbf{W} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \right)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{W} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_d(Z_1) - \mu_d(0) \\ \vdots \\ \mu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \mu_d(0) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$B_n := \gamma(0) \cdot e_1^T \left(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^T \mathbf{W} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \right)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{W} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_d(Z_1) - \nu_d(0) \\ \vdots \\ \nu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \nu_d(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It will become clear that $R = O_p(h_n^2/r_n)$.

We first analyze A_n . Note that the denominator is standard. From [Wand and Jones \(1995\)](#),

$$\left(\frac{1}{n_+} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^T \mathbf{W} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \right)^{-1} = [h_n \gamma_{2,1} \gamma_{0,1} - h_n \gamma_{1,1}^2 + o_p(h_n^2)]^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} h_n^2 \gamma_{2,1} + o_p(h_n^2) & -h_n \gamma_{1,1} + o_p(h_n) \\ * & \gamma_{0,1} + o_p(h_n^2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

where we have normalized $f(0)$ to 1. For the numerator,

$$\frac{1}{n_+} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{W} \begin{pmatrix} \mu_d(Z_1) - \mu_d(0) \\ \vdots \\ \mu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \mu_d(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) \\ \frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) \end{pmatrix}$$

We evaluate the expectation of each term with respect to \mathbf{Z} . First,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [K_h(Z_i) (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0))] \\ &= \int_0^1 K \left(\frac{z}{h_n} \right) (\mu_d(z) - \mu_d(0)) dF(z) \\ &= h_n \int_0^1 K(x) (\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0)) dF(x) \quad \text{by the change of variables: } x = z/h_n \\ &= \frac{h_n^2}{r_n} \left(\Gamma(r_n) \int_0^1 K(x) dF(x) + o(1) \right) = \frac{h_n^2}{r_n} (\Gamma(r_n) \cdot \gamma_{0,1} + o(1)) , \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the last equality above follows from [Lemma 9](#), which also provides the exact form of

$\Gamma(r_n)$. By a similar set of manipulations,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) \right] \\ &= \frac{h_n^2}{r_n} \left(\Gamma(r_n) \int_0^1 x K(x) dF(x) + o(1) \right) = \frac{h_n^2}{r_n} (\Gamma(r_n) \cdot \gamma_{1,1} + o(1)) . \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Combining equations (13), (14) and (15), we have that

$$A_n = O_p \left(\frac{h_n^2}{r_n} \right)$$

Finally, observe that $\frac{1}{2}m_{zz}^+(0)Z_i^2$ contributes to the standard $O_p(h_n^2)$ bias term in RDD. It is also straightforward to show that the residual corresponding to $\delta_z(0)Z_i\mu_d(Z_i)$ and $\delta_z(0)Z_i^2\mu_d(Z_i)$ are h_n times smaller than the above display.

Next, consider B_n . The denominator is the same as for A_n and its limit is given by Equation (13). To analyze the numerator, first observe that

$$\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} & \text{if } Z_i \leq -r_n \\ \frac{Z_i}{2r_n} & \text{if } -r_n \leq Z_i \leq r_n \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } Z_i \geq r_n \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

As such, if $h_n \ll r_n$, $\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0) = O_p(h_n)$ conditional on $Z_i \in [-h_n, h_n]$. It is therefore immediate that analogs of Equations 14 and 15 hold for B_n . Therefore, we also have that

$$B_n = O_p \left(\frac{h_n^2}{r_n} \right) .$$

It remains to note that the residual error from approximating $\gamma(Z_i)$ at $\gamma(0)$ is $O_p(h_n^2)$, as in the case with $\delta(\cdot)$ above.

Conclude that

$$\hat{\beta}_0^+ \xrightarrow{p} m^+(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) .$$

A similar set of manipulations gives us that

$$\hat{\beta}_0^- \xrightarrow{p} m^-(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) .$$

The stated properties on $\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}}$ follow immediately.

Case 2: $r_n/h_n \rightarrow 0$

Again, start by considering A_n . For $Z_i \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) \right] \\ &= h_n \int_0^1 K(x) (\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0)) dF(x) \quad \text{by the change of variables: } x = z/h_n \\ &= h_n \int_{w_n}^1 K(x) \left(\frac{\tau_d + \delta(0)\gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + O(h_n + \bar{\delta}^{w_n/r_n}) \right) dF(x) + O(w_n h_n) \\ &= h_n \left(\frac{\tau_d + \delta(0)\gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} \cdot \gamma_{0,1} + o(1) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 9 and the fact that the integrand is bounded.

And similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) \right] \\ &= h_n^2 \left(\frac{\tau_d + \delta(0)\gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} \gamma_{1,1} + o(1) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Combining equations (13), (17) and (18) gives us

$$A_n = \delta(0) \cdot \frac{\tau_d + \delta(0)\gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + O_p(h_n)$$

Next, consider B_n . From Equation 16, we have that $|Z_i| \in [w_n, 1]$, $\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0) = \text{sgn}(Z_i)/2$. On $[-w_n, w_n]$, the term is bounded. As such, we can write:

$$\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0) = \frac{1}{2} \text{sgn}(Z_i) + O(w_n)$$

uniformly over $Z_i \in \mathcal{Z}$. By similar manipulations as for A_n , but using the approximation above,

$$B_n = \frac{\gamma(0)}{2} + O_p(h_n).$$

As such,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}_0^+ &= m^+(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) + \delta(0) \cdot \frac{\tau_d + \gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} + \frac{\gamma(0)}{2} + O_p(h_n) \\ \hat{\beta}_0^- &= m^-(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) - \delta(0) \cdot \frac{\tau_d + \gamma(0)}{2(1 - \delta(0))} - \frac{\gamma(0)}{2} + O_p(h_n)\end{aligned}$$

So that

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{\tau_d + \gamma(0)}{1 - \delta(0)}$$

□

Case 3: $r_n = \frac{1}{2}ch_n$

As before,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} &\left[\frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) \right] \\ &= h_n \int_0^1 K(x) (\mu_d(xh_n) - \mu_d(0)) dF(x) \quad \text{by the change of variables: } x = z/h_n \\ &= h_n \int_0^1 K(x) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|x|}{c} \right\} \cdot (\tau_d \cdot (\lambda^+(x) - \lambda^-(x)) + \lambda(0) ((\lambda^+(x) - 1) - \lambda^-(x)) + o(1)) dF(x) \\ &= h_n \left(\tau_d \Lambda_{0,1,1}^+ + \gamma(0) \tilde{\Lambda}_{0,1,1}^+ + o(1) \right)\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

where the second equality above follows from Lemma 9. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} &\left[\frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) \right] \\ &= h_n^2 \left(\tau_d \Lambda_{1,1,1}^+ + \gamma(0) \tilde{\Lambda}_{1,1,1}^+ + o(1) \right)\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

Combining equations (13), (19) and (20) gives us

$$A_n = \frac{\tau_d}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} \cdot (\gamma_{2,1}\Lambda_{0,1,1}^+ - \gamma_{1,1}\Lambda_{1,1,1}^+) \\ + \frac{\gamma(0)}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} \cdot (\gamma_{2,1}\tilde{\Lambda}_{0,1,1}^+ - \gamma_{1,1}\tilde{\Lambda}_{1,1,1}^+) + O_p(h_n) .$$

Next, for B_n , write:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \right] \\ = h_n \int_0^1 K(x) (\nu_d(xh_n) - \nu_d(0)) dF(x) \quad \text{by the change of variables: } x = z/h_n \\ = h_n \int_0^1 K(x) \left(\tilde{d}\left(\frac{x}{c}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \right) dF(x) \\ = h_n (\Gamma_{0,1,1}^+ + o(1)) \tag{21}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n_+} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \right] = h_n^2 (\Gamma_{1,1,1}^+ + o(1)) . \tag{22}$$

By Equations (13), (21) and (22), we have that

$$B_n = \frac{\gamma_{2,1}\Gamma_{0,1,1}^+ - \gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,1,1}^+}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} + O_p(h_n) .$$

Noting that the usual bias term coming from m_{zz} is smaller than the above, we therefore have that:

$$\hat{\beta}_0^+ = m^+(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) \\ + \frac{\delta(0)\tau_d}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} \cdot (\gamma_{2,1}\Lambda_{0,1,1}^+ - \gamma_{1,1}\Lambda_{1,1,1}^+) \\ + \frac{\delta(0)\gamma(0)}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} \cdot (\gamma_{2,1}\tilde{\Lambda}_{0,1,1}^+ - \gamma_{1,1}\tilde{\Lambda}_{1,1,1}^+) \\ + \gamma(0) \cdot \frac{\gamma_{2,1}\Gamma_{0,1,1}^+ - \gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,1,1}^+}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} + O_p(h_n) .$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\beta}_0^- &= m^-(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) \\
&+ \frac{\delta(0)\tau_d}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} \cdot (\gamma_{2,1}\Lambda_{0,1,1}^- - \gamma_{1,1}\Lambda_{1,1,1}^-) \\
&+ \frac{\delta(0)\gamma(0)}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} \cdot (\gamma_{2,1}\tilde{\Lambda}_{0,1,1}^- - \gamma_{1,1}\tilde{\Lambda}_{1,1,1}^-) \\
&+ \gamma(0) \cdot \frac{\gamma_{2,1}\Gamma_{0,1,1}^- - \gamma_{1,1}\Gamma_{1,1,1}^-}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} + O_p(h_n)
\end{aligned}$$

As such,

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{RDD}} = \tau_* + O_p(h_n) ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_* - \tau_d &= \frac{\delta(0)\tau_d}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} \cdot (\gamma_{2,1} (\Lambda_{0,1,1}^+ - \Lambda_{0,1,1}^-) - \gamma_{1,1} (\Lambda_{1,1,1}^+ - \Lambda_{1,1,1}^-)) \\
&+ \frac{\delta(0)\gamma(0)}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} \cdot (\gamma_{2,1} (\tilde{\Lambda}_{0,1,1}^+ - \tilde{\Lambda}_{0,1,1}^-) - \gamma_{1,1} (\tilde{\Lambda}_{1,1,1}^+ - \tilde{\Lambda}_{1,1,1}^-)) \\
&+ \frac{\gamma(0)}{\gamma_{2,1}\gamma_{0,1} - \gamma_{1,1}^2} (\gamma_{2,1} (\Gamma_{0,1,1}^+ - \Gamma_{0,1,1}^-) - \gamma_{1,1} (\Gamma_{1,1,1}^+ - \Gamma_{1,1,1}^-)) .
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

and $\Lambda, \tilde{\Lambda}, \Gamma$ are as in Definition 12. □

A.4 Proof of Theorem 2

As before, first consider the case then $Z_i \geq 0$ and write

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_i &= m^+(Z_i) + \delta(Z_i)\mu_d(Z_i) + \gamma(Z_i)\nu_d(Z_i) + \varepsilon_i \\
&= m^+(0) + \delta(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma(0)\nu_d(0) + (m_z^+(0) + \delta_z(0)\mu_d(0) + \gamma_z(0)\nu_d(0)) \cdot Z_i + \frac{1}{2}m_{zz}^+(0) \cdot Z_i^2 \\
&\quad + \delta(0)(\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) + \delta_z(0)Z_i(\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{zz}(0)Z_i^2\mu_d(Z_i) \\
&\quad + \gamma(0)(\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) + \gamma_z(0)Z_i(\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{zz}(0)Z_i^2\nu_d(Z_i) \\
&\quad + \varepsilon_i + O(h_n^3) .
\end{aligned}$$

The local linear estimator is

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\beta}^+ &= \left(\frac{1}{n_+h_n} (\mathbf{Z}^+)^T \mathbf{WZ}^+ \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_+h_n} \mathbf{Z}^+ \right)^T \mathbf{WY}^+ \\
&= \beta^+ - \left(\frac{1}{n_+h_n} (\mathbf{Z}^+)^T \mathbf{WZ}^+ \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n_+h_n} \mathbf{Z}^+ \right)^T \mathbf{W} \left((\mathbf{Z}^+ - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^+) \beta^+ + \mathcal{E} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{Z}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & Z_1 & \hat{\mu}_d(Z_1) - \hat{\mu}_d(0) & Z_1(\hat{\mu}_d(Z_1) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) & \nu_d(Z_1) - \nu_d(0) & Z_1(\nu_d(Z_1) - \nu_d(0)) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & Z_{n_+} & \hat{\mu}_d(Z_{n_+}) - \hat{\mu}_d(0) & Z_{n_+}(\hat{\mu}_d(Z_{n_+}) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) & \nu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \nu_d(0) & Z_{n_+}(\nu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \nu_d(0)) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & Z_1 & \mu_d(Z_1) - \mu_d(0) & Z_1(\mu_d(Z_1) - \mu_d(0)) & \nu_d(Z_1) - \nu_d(0) & Z_1(\nu_d(Z_1) - \nu_d(0)) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & Z_{n_+} & \mu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \mu_d(0) & Z_{n_+}(\mu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \mu_d(0)) & \nu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \nu_d(0) & Z_{n_+}(\nu_d(Z_{n_+}) - \nu_d(0)) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbf{W} = \text{diag} (K_h(Z_1) \cdots K_h(Z_{n_+})) .$$

The structure of the proof proceeds as follows. We will first show that the $\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i)$'s are uniformly close to $\mu_d(Z_i)$ in an appropriate sense. We then use this fact to show that the

“denominator” and the “numerator” converge:

$$\underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} (\mathbf{Z}^+)^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z}^+\right)^{-1}}_{\text{denominator}} \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \mathbf{Z}^+\right)^T \mathbf{W} \left(\left(\mathbf{Z}^+ - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^+\right) \beta^+ + \mathcal{E}\right)}_{\text{numerator}} = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n h_n}}\right)$$

Step 1: $\hat{\mu}_m(Z_i)$ is close to $\mu_d(Z_i)$

We will show that the “structural part” of $\hat{\mu}_d^+(Z_i) - \mu_d^+(Z_i)$, to be defined below – is close to $\mu_d(Z_i)$. This part proceeds via an ε -net argument.

Let w_n be such that $h_n \gg w_n \gg n^{-1+\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. For a given k , define the interval $R_k := [kw_n, (k+1)w_n]$ and consider

$$n_k := \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{Z_j \in R_k\} .$$

Since Z is uniformly distributed on $[-1, 1]$, $\mathbb{E}[n_k] = nw_n$ (where we have normalized $f(0)$ to 1). By Chernoff’s Inequality (Exercise 2.3.5 in [Vershynin 2018](#)),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|n_k - \frac{nw_n}{2}\right| \leq \frac{nw_n}{2}\right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{c_0 nw_n}{4}\right)$$

where c_0 is a constant that does not depend on n . Now, let Γ_0 be the event that $\left|n_k - \frac{nw_n}{2}\right| \leq \frac{nw_n}{2}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|k| \leq \frac{h_n}{w_n}$. In words, Γ_0 is the event that on $[-h_n, h_n]$, every sub-interval of the form $[kw_n, (k+1)w_n]$ has number of observations close to n_w . By the union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_0) \geq 1 - \frac{2h_n}{w_n} \exp\left(-\frac{cnw_n}{4}\right) \rightarrow 1 .$$

where the limit obtains because nh_n is of polynomial order with respect to nw_n .

Next, define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_w(k) &:= \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{j=1}^n (m(Z_j) + \delta(Z_j)\mu_d(Z_j) + \gamma(Z_j)\nu_d(Z_j)) \mathbf{1}\{Z_j \in R_k\} \\ \mu_w(k) &:= \mathbb{E}[m(Z_j) + \delta(Z_j)\mu_d(Z_j) + \gamma(Z_j)\nu_d(Z_j) \mid Z_j \in R_k] . \end{aligned}$$

On the interval R_k , the value of $(m(z) + \delta(z)\mu_d(z) + \gamma(z)\nu_d(z))$ cannot vary by more than

$c_1 w_n$ for some c_1 that is independent of n . This is because each component is bounded and Lipschitz. By Hoeffding's Inequality (Theorem 2.2.6 in [Vershynin 2018](#)):

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\mu}_w(k) - \mu_w(k)| \leq t) \geq 1 - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2 n_k^2}{n_k c_1^2 w_n^2}\right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2 n}{2c_1^2 w_n}\right) \text{ on } \Gamma_0$$

Now, let $t_n = h_n^{1/2}$ and set $t = 1/\sqrt{nt_n}$ above. Then the RHS in the above display goes to 0.

As before, let Γ_1 be the event that $|\hat{\mu}_w(k) - \mu_w(k)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{nt_n}}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|k| \leq \frac{h_n}{w_n}$.

Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_1) \geq 1 - \frac{2h_n}{w_n} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2c_1^2 t_n w_n}\right) - \frac{2h_n}{w_n} \exp\left(-\frac{cnw_n}{4}\right) \rightarrow 1.$$

Next, we approximate $\hat{\mu}_d^+(Z_i)$ using $\hat{\mu}_w(k)$. The argument for $\hat{\mu}_d^-(Z_i)$ is similar. Write

$$\hat{\mu}_d^+(Z_i) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \sum_{j \in \hat{R}^+(Z_i)} m(Z_j) + \delta(Z_j) \mu_d(Z_j) + \gamma(Z_j) \nu_d(Z_j)}_{=:\hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \sum_{j \in \hat{R}^+(Z_i)} \varepsilon_j}_{=:\hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^+(Z_i)}. \quad (24)$$

We will also use the notation that $\hat{\mu}_a(Z_i) = w^+(Z_i) \hat{\mu}_a^+(Z_i) + w^-(Z_i) \hat{\mu}_a^-(Z_i)$ for $a \in \{d, m, \varepsilon\}$.

Let $\hat{\mu}_{m,w}^+(Z_i)$ be the approximation of $\hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i)$ by $\hat{\mu}_w(k)$ as follows. Write

$$R^+(Z_i) = [\max\{Z_i - r_n, 0\}, Z_i + r_n] = [k_l w_n + e_l, k_u w_n + e_u]$$

for $k_l, k_u \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \leq e_u \leq w_n$ and $-w_n \leq e_l \leq 0$. Then our approximation is

$$|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)| \cdot \hat{\mu}_{m,w}^+(Z_i) = n_u \hat{\mu}_w(k_u + 1) + n_l \hat{\mu}_w(k_l - 1) + \sum_{k=k_l}^{k_u} n_k \hat{\mu}_w(k).$$

Here, n_l and n_u are the number of observations in $[k_l + e_l, k_l)$ and $[k_u, k_u + e_u]$ respectively.

In other words, we approximate observations in $[k_l + e_l, k_l)$ and $[k_u, k_u + e_u]$ using the $\hat{\mu}_w(k)$ of the R_k that contains them. The other parts of $\hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i)$ unchanged. Because we always approximate an end segment with the mean of the R_k on the same side of the boundary, the approximation error must be smaller than $c_1 w_n$ per observation. As such, if $Z_i + r_n \geq K_n w_n$,

then

$$|\hat{\mu}_{m,w}^+(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i)| \leq \frac{2c_1 n w_n^2}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \leq \frac{5c_1 w_n}{2K_n} \text{ on } \Gamma_0$$

On the other hand, if $0 \leq Z_i + r_n \leq K_n w_n$,

$$|\hat{\mu}_{m,w}^+(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i)| \leq w_n \text{ on } \Gamma_0 .$$

Next, write:

$$|\hat{\mu}_{m,w}^+(Z_i) - \mu_d^+(Z_i)| \leq A_1 + A_2$$

where

$$\mu_d^+(Z_i) = \mathbb{E} \left[m(Z_j) + \delta(Z_j)\mu_d(Z_j) + \gamma(Z_j)\nu_d(Z_j) \mid Z_j \in R^+(Z_i) \right]$$

and

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \left(n_u |\hat{\mu}_w(k_u + 1) - \mu_w(k_u + 1)| + n_l |\hat{\mu}_w(k_l - 1) - \mu_w(k_l - 1)| + \sum_{k=k_l}^{k_u} n_k |\hat{\mu}_w(k) - \mu_w(k)| \right)$$

$$A_2 = \left| \frac{1}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \left(n_u \mu_w(k_u + 1) + n_l \mu_w(k_l - 1) + \sum_{k=k_l}^{k_u} n_k \mu_w(k) \right) - \mu_d^+(Z_i) \right| .$$

On Γ_1 ,

$$A_1 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{nt_n}} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}}$$

On the other hand, it is bounded even off Γ_1 . As such, $A_1 = o_p(1/\sqrt{nh_n})$ uniformly across $Z_i \in [-h_n, h_n]$.

Meanwhile,

$$A_2 \leq \left| \sum_{k=k_l}^{k_u} \left(\frac{n_k}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} - \frac{w_n}{|R^+(Z_i)|} \right) \mu_w(k) \right|$$

$$+ \left| \frac{n_u}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \mu_w(k_u + 1) - \frac{e_u}{|R^+(Z_i)|} \mathbb{E} \left[m(Z_j) + \delta(Z_j)\mu_d(Z_j) + \gamma(Z_j)\nu_d(Z_j) \mid Z_j \in [Z_i + r_n - e_u, Z_i + r_n] \right] \right|$$

$$+ \left| \frac{n_l}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \mu_w(k_l - 1) - \frac{e_l}{|R^+(Z_i)|} \mathbb{E} \left[m(Z_j) + \delta(Z_j)\mu_d(Z_j) + \gamma(Z_j)\nu_d(Z_j) \mid Z_j \in [Z_i - r_n, Z_i - r_n - e_l] \right] \right| .$$

Now, let $K = k_u - k_l + 1$ be the total number of w_n intervals in $\hat{R}^+(Z_i)$ and let $n^K = \sum_{k=k_l}^{k_u} n_k$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n_k}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} - \frac{w_n}{|R^+(Z_i)|} &= \frac{n^K}{n_l + n_u + n^K} \left(\frac{n_k}{n^K} - \frac{1}{K} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{n^K}{n_l + n_u + n^K} \left(\frac{1}{K} - \frac{w_n}{Kw_n - e_l + e_u} \right) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{n^K}{n_l + n_u + n^K} - 1 \right) \frac{w_n}{|R^+(Z_i)|} \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $|R^+(Z_i)| = Kw_n - e_l + e_u$ and $|\hat{R}(Z_i)| = n_l + n_u + n_K$. On Γ_0 ,

$$n_u \leq n_{k_u+1} \leq 2nw_n \quad , \quad n_l \leq n_{k_l-1} \leq 2nw_n \quad , \quad \frac{n_k}{n_K} \leq \frac{4}{K}$$

Furthermore, $\mu_w(k) \leq M$. As such, if $Z_i + r_n \geq K_n w_n$, we have that uniformly,

$$\frac{n^K}{n_l + n_u + n^K} \left(\frac{1}{K} - \frac{w_n}{Kw_n - e_l + e_u} \right) + \left(\frac{n^K}{n_l + n_u + n^K} - 1 \right) \frac{w_n}{|R^+(Z_i)|} = O\left(\frac{1}{K_n^2}\right).$$

Now,

$$\sum_{k=k_l}^{k_u} \left(\frac{n_k}{n^K} - \frac{1}{K} \right) \mu_w(k) = \frac{1}{n^K} \sum_{i=1}^{n^K} S_i - E[S_i]$$

where S_i are i.i.d. drawn from the uniform distribution on $\{\mu_w(k_l), \dots, \mu_w(k_u)\}$. By Hoeffding's Inequality, we then have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n^K} \sum_{i=1}^{n^K} S_i - E[S_i] \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{nt_n}} \right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2n^K}{c_1^2 r_n^2 nt_n} \right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp \left(-\frac{c_2 K_n w_n}{h_n^2 t_n} \right) \text{ on } \Gamma_0$$

where $t_n = h_n^{1/2}$ as before. Let $\Gamma_2 \subset \Gamma_0$ be the event that the above inequality holds for all $Z_i \in [-h_n, h_n]$. Because of the discretization into w_n ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_2) \geq 1 - c_3 \cdot \frac{h_n}{w_n} \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{c_2 K_n w_n}{h_n^2 t_n} \right) - \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_0^c) \quad (25)$$

By the same reasoning as above, we also have that if $Z_i \geq K_n w_n$, then

$$\left| \frac{n_u}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \mu_w(k_u + 1) - \frac{e_u}{|R^+(Z_i)|} \mathbb{E} \left[m(Z_j) + \delta(Z_j) \mu_d(Z_j) + \gamma(Z_j) \nu_d(Z_j) \mid Z_j \in [Z_i + r_n - e_u, Z_i + r_n] \right] \right| = O_p \left(\frac{1}{K_n^2} \right),$$

$$\left| \frac{n_l}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \mu_w(k_l - 1) - \frac{e_l}{|R^+(Z_i)|} \mathbb{E} \left[m(Z_j) + \delta(Z_j) \mu_d(Z_j) + \gamma(Z_j) \nu_d(Z_j) \mid Z_j \in [Z_i - r_n, Z_i - r_n - e_l] \right] \right| = O_p \left(\frac{1}{K_n^2} \right).$$

On the other hand, if $Z_i + r_n \in [0, K_n w_n]$, we simply bound A_2 by $K_n w_n$

Putting the bounds together, we have that if $Z_i + r_n \notin [0, K_n w_n]$, then on Γ_2 ,

$$W^+(Z_i) \left| \hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i) - \mu_d^+(Z_i) \right| \leq \frac{5c_1 w_n}{2K_n} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{nt_n}} + \frac{c_4}{K_n^2}$$

On the other hand, if $Z_i \in [0, K_n w_n]$, then again on Γ_2 ,

$$W^+(Z_i) \left| \hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i) - \mu_d^+(Z_i) \right| \leq \frac{K_n w_n}{2r_n} \left(w_n + \frac{1}{\sqrt{nt_n}} + K_n w_n \right)$$

For simplicity, suppose $h_n = n^{-1/4+\alpha}$ for some $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{3}$. Let $w_n = n^{-1+\varepsilon_w}$ where $0 < \varepsilon_w < \frac{\alpha}{2}$ and $K_n = n^{1/4-\alpha+\varepsilon_k}$ where $0 < \varepsilon_k \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}$. Then $K_n \rightarrow \infty$, $w_n \rightarrow 0$, $w_n \gg 1/n$ and $K_n w_n \ll h_n$. (Recall $t_n = \sqrt{h_n}$.) It is straightforward to verify that $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_2) \rightarrow 1$ and on Γ_2 ,

$$W^+(Z_i) \left| \hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i) - \mu_d^+(Z_i) \right| \leq c_5 h_n^2$$

where c_5 is independent of Z_i . By a similar argument for the $\hat{\mu}_m^-(Z_i)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_m(Z_i) &= w^+(Z_i) \hat{\mu}_m^+(Z_i) + w^-(Z_i) \hat{\mu}_m^-(Z_i) \\ &= w^+(Z_i) \mu_d^+(Z_i) + w^-(Z_i) \mu_d^-(Z_i) + o_p(h_n^2) = \mu_d(Z_i) + o_p(h_n^2) \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Step 2: Denominator Converges

We next show that

$$\hat{\mathbf{D}} := \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} (\mathbf{Z}^+)^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{Z}^+ \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} (\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^+)^T \mathbf{W} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^+ =: \mathbf{D}.$$

before evaluating the probability limit of D . The symmetric matrix $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ has entries:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{11} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{12} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{22} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i^2 \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{13} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{23} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{33} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0))^2 \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{14} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{24} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i^2 (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{34} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0))^2 \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{44} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i^2 (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0))^2 \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{15} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{25} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{35} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{45} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{55} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0))^2 \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{16} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{26} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i^2 (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{36} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{46} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i^2 (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0)) (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{56} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0))^2 \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{66} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) Z_i^2 (\nu_d(Z_i) - \nu_d(0))^2
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ and \mathbf{D} agree on all entries except in the third and fourth columns due to the estimation of $\mu_d(Z_i)$ with $\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i)$. As such, we only have to bound the differences in these columns.

Start with $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{13}$. By Equation (26), write:

$$\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) = \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\hat{\mu}_\varepsilon(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon(0)) + o_p(h_n^2)$$

Let

$$\bar{\mu}_\varepsilon(Z_i) = \frac{1}{2nr_n} \sum_{j \in \hat{R}(Z_i)} \varepsilon_j .$$

Let Γ_3 be the event on which $|n_k - \frac{nw_n}{2}| \leq \frac{(nw_n)^{2/3}}{2}$ for all $|k| \leq h_n/w_n$. Then, by Chernoff's Inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_3) \geq 1 - \frac{2h_n}{w_n} \exp(-c_0\sqrt{nw_n})$$

Observe that if $Z_i + r_n \notin [0, K_n w_n]$, we have on Γ_3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{w^+(Z_i)}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} &= \frac{1}{2nr_n} \cdot \frac{Kw_n + e_u + e_l}{Kw_n} \cdot \frac{n^K}{n_u + n_l + n^K} \cdot \frac{Knw_n}{n^K} \\ &= \frac{1}{2nr_n} \left(1 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{K_n^2}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{2nr_n} \left(1 + o_p\left(\frac{1}{h_n^2}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constants above are uniform. On the other hand, if $Z_i + r_n \in [0, K_n w_n]$, define

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) w^+(Z_i) \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^+(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{Z_i \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} \sum_{j=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) w^+(Z_i) \frac{1}{|\hat{R}^+(Z_i)|} \varepsilon_j \mathbf{1}\{Z_i \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\} \mathbf{1}\{|Z_i - Z_j| \leq r_n\} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\mathbb{E}[A_3] = 0$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[A_3^2 | \mathbf{Z}] &= \frac{1}{n_+^2 h_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} \sum_{j=1}^{n_+} \sum_{k=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) w^+(Z_i) K_h(Z_j) w^+(Z_j) E[\varepsilon_k^2 | \mathbf{Z}] \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_i \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\} \mathbf{1}\{|Z_i - Z_k| \leq r_n\} \mathbf{1}\{Z_j \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\} \mathbf{1}\{|Z_j - Z_k| \leq r_n\} \\ &\leq \bar{\sigma}^2 \frac{K_n^2 w_n^2}{n_+^2 h_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} \sum_{j=1}^{n_+} \sum_{k=1}^{n_+} \mathbf{1}\{Z_i \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\} \mathbf{1}\{Z_j \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\} \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_k \in [-2r_n, K_n w_n]\} \end{aligned}$$

By the standard change-of-variables argument,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_+^3 h_n^3} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} \sum_{j=1}^{n_+} \sum_{k=1}^{n_+} \mathbf{1}\{Z_i \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\} \mathbf{1}\{Z_j \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\} \\ \cdot \mathbf{1}\{Z_k \in [-2r_n, K_n w_n]\} = O_p(K_n^2 w_n^2 r_n) \end{aligned}$$

As such, by our choice of h_n, w_n and K_n ,

$$\mathbb{E}[A_3^2] = O_p(K_n^4 w_n^4 n h_n^2) = o_p\left(\frac{1}{nh_n}\right)$$

In other words, we can replace A_3 with

$$\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) w^+(Z_i) \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon^+(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{Z_i \in [-r_n, -r_n + K_n w_n]\}$$

and the approximation error incurred will be $o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right)$.

Conclude that

$$\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^+(Z_i) = \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon^+(Z_i) + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right) + o_p(h_n^2) .$$

By a similar argument for $\hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^-(Z_i)$, we then have that

$$\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) \hat{\mu}_\varepsilon^-(Z_i) = \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon^-(Z_i) + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right) + o_p(h_n^2) .$$

Now write, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
A_4 &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon(Z_i) \\
&= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) \frac{1}{2nr_n} \sum_{j \neq i} \varepsilon_j \cdot \mathbf{1}\{|Z_j - Z_i| \leq r_n\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \frac{1}{2nr_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \varepsilon_j \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) \mathbf{1}\{|Z_j - Z_i| \leq r_n\}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, $\mathbb{E}[A_4 | \mathbf{Z}] = 0$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
E[A_4^2 | \mathbf{Z}] &= \left(\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \frac{1}{2nr_n} \right)^2 \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_k | \mathbf{Z}] \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} \sum_{j=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) K_h(Z_j) \mathbf{1}\{|Z_k - Z_i| \leq r_n\} \mathbf{1}\{|Z_k - Z_j| \leq r_n\} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \frac{1}{2nr_n} \right)^2 \bar{\sigma}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} \sum_{j=1}^{n_+} \sum_{k=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) K_h(Z_j) \mathbf{1}\{|Z_k| \leq r_n + h_n\} \\
&= O_p \left(\frac{1}{nh_n} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows from the usual change-of-variables argument.

Putting the above bounds together, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{13} &= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\hat{\mu}_d(Z_i) - \hat{\mu}_d(0)) \\
&= \frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n_+} K_h(Z_i) (\mu_d(Z_i) - \mu_d(0)) + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}} \right) \\
&= \mathbf{D}_{13} + O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Arguing similarly, it is straightforward to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{23} &= \mathbf{D}_{23} + O_p\left(\frac{h_n}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{33} &= \mathbf{D}_{33} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{nh_n}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{14} &= \mathbf{D}_{14} + O_p\left(\frac{h_n}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{24} &= \mathbf{D}_{24} + O_p\left(\frac{h_n^2}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{34} &= \mathbf{D}_{34} + O_p\left(\frac{h_n}{nh_n}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{44} &= \mathbf{D}_{44} + O_p\left(\frac{h_n^2}{nh_n}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{35} &= \mathbf{D}_{35} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{45} &= \mathbf{D}_{45} + O_p\left(\frac{h_n}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{36} &= \mathbf{D}_{36} + O_p\left(\frac{h_n}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right) \\
\hat{\mathbf{D}}_{46} &= \mathbf{D}_{46} + O_p\left(\frac{h_n^2}{\sqrt{nh_n}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

By application of Lemma 9, we also have that to a first order,

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi(0,0,0,1) & h_n\phi(1,0,0,1) & \phi(0,1,0,1) & h_n\phi(1,1,0,1) & \phi(0,0,1,1) & h_n\phi(1,0,1,1) \\ * & h_n^2\phi(2,0,0,1) & h_n\phi(1,1,0,1) & h_n^2\phi(2,1,0,1) & h_n\phi(1,0,1,1) & h_n^2\phi(2,0,1,1) \\ * & * & \phi(0,2,0,1) & h_n\phi(1,2,0,1) & \phi(0,1,1,1) & h_n\phi(1,1,1,1) \\ * & * & * & h_n^2\phi(2,2,0,1) & h_n\phi(1,1,1,1) & h_n^2\phi(2,1,1,1) \\ * & * & * & * & \phi(0,0,2,1) & h_n\phi(1,0,2,1) \\ * & * & * & * & * & h_n^2\phi(2,0,2,1) \end{pmatrix} + R$$

where each term in R is strictly of a smaller order than their counterparts in the matrix

above. Now, using similar analysis as above, it is straightforward to show that

$$\left(\frac{1}{n_+ h_n} \mathbf{Z}^+\right)^T \mathbf{W} \left((\mathbf{Z}^+ - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^+) \beta^+ + \mathcal{E} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n h_n}} \right) \\ O_p \left(\frac{h_n}{\sqrt{n h_n}} \right) \\ O_p \left(\frac{1}{n h_n} \right) \\ O_p \left(\frac{h_n}{n h_n} \right) \\ O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n h_n}} \right) \\ O_p \left(\frac{h_n}{\sqrt{n h_n}} \right) \end{pmatrix}$$

Analogously for $\hat{\beta}^-$. Conclude that $\hat{\beta}^+ - \beta^+ = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n h_n}} \right)$. □