

L-Estimation in Instrumental Variables Regression for Censored Data in Presence of Endogeneity under Dependent Errors

Swati Shukla¹, Subhra Sankar Dhar², Shalabh³

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur
Kanpur 208016, India

Emails: ¹shukla@iitk.ac.in, ²subhra@iitk.ac.in, ³shalab@iitk.ac.in

September 4, 2024

Abstract

In this article, we propose L-estimators of the unknown parameters in the instrumental variables regression in the presence of censored data under endogeneity. We allow the random errors involved in the model to be dependent. The proposed estimation procedure is a two-stage procedure, and the large sample properties of the proposed estimators are established. The utility of the proposed methodology is demonstrated for various simulated data and a benchmark real data set.

Key Words: L-estimation, Tobit model, endogeneity, control variables, two-stage estimation, exogenous variable, instrumental variables.

1 Introduction, Literature Review and Preliminaries

We consider the problem of estimation of parameters associated with the instrumental variables regression (see, e.g., [51], [3], [36], [35], [45], [6], [49], [16], [43], [29], [1], and [7]) for censored data under the violation of the regularity assumption that regressors are uncorrelated with unobserved random errors in the model. In the literature, this situation is described as the presence of endogeneity in the model, as the regressors correlated with errors are called endogenous. For the sake of exposition simplicity, here we consider the estimation of the parameters associated with the aforesaid model under the presence of one endogenous regressor. Till now, various estimation procedures have been proposed to estimate the parameters associated with various regression models for censored data under the presence of endogeneity in the model (see, e.g., [10], [21], [5], [46], [13], [12], [25], [28], [26], and [9]). The main limitation of the aforesaid method is their reliance on moment conditions, which lead to some serious model identifiability issues. Additionally, these methods impose conditions on the error distribution, requiring it to have finite moments, thereby excluding distributions like the Cauchy distribution. Therefore, most of these methods may not perform well due to their stringent theoretical assumptions, which are difficult to meet in practice.

In contrast, the theoretical requirements of our proposed estimator are less cumbersome than the existing methodologies. Moreover, our estimator accommodates error distributions with non-finite moments and performs well in these conditions. Furthermore, the proposed class of L-estimators consists of several estimators in the context of censored regression. This class of L-estimator is also robust to the large number of censored observations and offers an advantage in practice.

The common procedure to deal with the endogeneity is to adopt a two-stage estimation procedure in which one takes suitable measures to remove the endogeneity from the model in the first step and subsequently applies a suitable estimation procedure (see, e.g. [38], [34], [44]). In this work, we also adopt a two-step estimation procedure by using the instrumental variables regression approach, which is often referred to as the control function approach (see, e.g., [45]) to remove the endogeneity, and then propose a class of smooth L-estimators taking advantage of the continuity of the censored quantile regression coefficient process. The proposed class of estimators that are analogous to L-estimators for linear regression models, as L-estimators are well-known for their robustness property when the data are generated from a heavy-tailed distribution and/or the data consist of some outliers (see, e.g., [24]). Furthermore, we establish the consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed L-estimators and study the performance of the proposed methodology on simulated and real data sets. With notations, the problem is briefly described in the following.

Let $(y_1, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, w_1)^T, \dots, (y_n, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_n, w_n)^T$ be n independent observations on the random vector $(Y, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}, W)^T$, where Y denotes the response variable, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ denotes the vector of p exogenous regressors, and W denotes an endogenous regressor. Note that for the sake of exposition, we have taken only one endogenous regressor; however, in principle, one may take more than one endogenous regressor as well. We now wish to fit the following linear regression model to the observed censored data:

$$y_i = \max(c, y_i^*) = \max\{c, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + w_i \gamma_0 + \epsilon_i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $p \geq 1$ is the vector of unknown parameters associated with the exogenous regressors including the intercept term, $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown parameter associated with the endogenous regressor, ϵ_i is an unobserved error term, and c denotes the censoring threshold which is assumed to be non-random and constant for all the observations. Here response variable y_i is fully observed but the latent variable y_i^* is not fully observed. A particular case of this model is the model with the censoring threshold $c = 0$, such a model is referred to as a Tobit model. In what follows, we restrict our study to Tobit models, since results can be relayed back to the model with censoring threshold c just by transforming y to $y - c$ for a known threshold c . Therefore, in this article, we are concerned with the following model:

$$y_i = \max\{0, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + w_i \gamma_0 + \epsilon_i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (1.2)$$

The model above in (1.2) is an instance of a linear regression model for censored data with left censoring at a non-random and constant censoring threshold $c = 0$. We assume errors ϵ_i 's to be identically distributed with some unknown distribution (denoted by F later on), and possibly dependent random variables. This model is often called the semi-parametric censored regression model since we assume the linearity of the regression function but we do not assume any parametric form of the error distribution F .

In the context of statistical inference, many estimation procedures are available for the estimation of the unknown parameters associated with the model (1.2) (see, e.g., [38], [39], [34], [40] and [44]). However, in the presence of endogeneity, parameter estimates from these conventional procedures do not have optimal properties. In such a situation, various methods have been proposed (see [5], [13], [25], [28], [26] and [9]) to deal with the endogeneity such that the parameter estimates have optimal properties. One such approach proposed by [45] uses the instrumental variables regression approach or control function approach to remove the endogeneity from the model. Subsequently, any suitable estimation procedure can be applied to estimate the parameters as if the regularity condition of uncorrelated errors is not violated.

In this work, we adopt a two-stage estimation procedure here. In the first stage, we employ the instrumental variables regression to account for the endogeneity in the model, and in the second stage, we define a class of estimators analogous to L-estimators in linear regression models. Given a response variable Y and a vector of regressors \mathbf{X} , the class of L-estimators for the linear regression model is defined as follows.

Let $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$ denote the conditional distribution of $Y|\mathbf{X}$, and the L-functional for $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$ is denoted as $T(F_{Y|\mathbf{X}})$, which is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) := T(F_{Y|\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{x}}) = \int_0^1 \mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau) d\mu(\tau), \quad (1.3)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau) := \inf\{y \in \mathcal{S} : F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(y) \geq \tau\}$ is the conditional quantile of $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$, \mathcal{S} denotes the support of $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$, and μ is a generic weight function that corresponds to a signed measure. The choice of μ can be any signed measure for functionals such as the measure of scale, skewness, and kurtosis (heavy tailedness) of the response, conditioned on covariates (see, [27]). However, when the functional of interest (or parameter) corresponds to a measure of location such as the population mean or quantile of the response, conditioned on covariates, the weight function is chosen to be a positive measure on $[0, 1]$ (see, [27]).

Further, a measure of location is equivariant to the linear transformation of the underlying random variable, i.e., for a random variable Z having a distribution F_Z , and a functional T_{loc} that corresponds to a measure of location, we have

$$T_{loc}(F_{aZ+b}) = aT_{loc}(F_Z) + b, \text{ for any } a, b \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since the conditional quantiles $\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$ are equivariant to linear transformation of Y that is $\mathcal{Q}_{aY+b|\mathbf{X}} = a\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}} + b$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, this implies that the L-functionals $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ (see (1.3)) are equivariant if

$$\int_0^1 d\mu(\tau) = 1.$$

Therefore, we are mainly concerned with the weight functions μ that are probability measures on $[0, 1]$ that split as follows:

$$\mu(B) = \alpha\lambda(B) + (1 - \alpha)\nu(B), \text{ for every Borel set } B \in \mathcal{B}, \alpha \in [0, 1], \quad (1.4)$$

where \mathcal{B} denotes Borel sigma algebra on $[0, 1]$, and λ and ν denote an absolutely continuous and discrete measures on $[0, 1]$, respectively.

Thus, the functional $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ encompasses various measures of locations for different choices of the weight function μ , hence forming a class of measures of location. A few examples of measures of location for different choices of weight function are in order. For a given $\tau \in [0, 1]$, the population conditional quantile $\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau)$ can be derived from $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ by choosing the weight function μ to be a single point mass distribution at τ . That is, take $\alpha = 0$, and ν be a single point mass distribution at τ in (1.4). The midrange of $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$, assuming that \mathcal{S} is bounded, can be obtained by taking $\alpha = 0$, and ν to be Bernoulli (1/2). This yields the midrange $[\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(0) + \mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(1)]/2$. Some other examples of location functionals with absolutely continuous choice of the weight function μ include the so-called ‘‘smoothed conditional quantiles’’. The smoothed conditional quantiles of $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$ can be derived from (1.4) by taking $\alpha = 1$, and choosing λ to be an absolutely continuous distribution. Following is an example of a smooth quantile:

$$T_{SCQ}(F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}) = \int_0^1 \mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau) \frac{1}{h(\pi)} K\left(\frac{\tau - \pi}{h(\pi)}\right) d\tau, \quad (1.5)$$

where K is a smoothing probability density with the bandwidth $h(\pi)$ depending on $\pi \in [0, 1]$ such that $0 < h(\pi) < \min(\pi, 1 - \pi)$. The conditional trimmed mean of the response variable can be derived from (1.5) by the following choice of smoothing density K , and the bandwidth $h(\pi)$:

$$K(u) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}(|u| \leq 1), u \in [0, 1], \pi = \frac{1}{2}(\pi_1 + \pi_2), h(\pi) = \frac{1}{2}(\pi_2 - \pi_1), \text{ such that } \pi_1 + \pi_2 = 1. \quad (1.6)$$

Now, using (1.6) along with (1.5) yields the following conditional trimmed mean functional:

$$T_{CTM}(F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}) = \frac{1}{\pi_2 - \pi_1} \int_{\pi_1}^{\pi_2} \mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau) d\tau. \quad (1.7)$$

Note that the conditional mean $\mathcal{E}(Y|\mathbf{X})$ is a particular case of $T_{CTM}(F_{Y|\mathbf{X}})$ for $\pi_1 = 0, \pi_2 = 1$. For other kinds of trimmed mean in the general non-parametric regression model, the readers may look at [18] and a few references therein.

We now want to discuss how to estimate functional $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ defined in (1.3) for some suitable choice of the weight function. One can estimate the functional $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ by plugging in an estimator of the conditional quantile $\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau)$ in (1.3), and observe that the conditional quantile $\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau)$ can in turn be estimated by plugging in an estimate of $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$. For a given n observations on the response and regressors, usually, one takes the empirical distribution function F_n (see, e.g., [42], [33]) as an estimate of $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$. In this case, an estimate of $\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau)$ is given by:

$$\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau) = \inf\{y \in \mathcal{S} : F_n(y) \geq \tau\}.$$

Note that for the regression model without covariates, $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_{Y|\mathbf{X}}(\tau)$ simply reduces to unconditional quantile $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_Y(\tau)$ that can be written in terms of order statistics $Y_{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, n$, as follows:

$$\hat{\mathcal{Q}}_Y(\tau) = Y_{(i)} \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{i-1}{n} < \tau \leq \frac{i}{n}, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Thus, for a regression model without covariates, the estimate of L-functional reduces to the following linear combinations of order statistics:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_{(i)} w_i, \quad w_i = \int_{(i-1)/n}^{i/n} d\mu(\tau).$$

However, for the linear regression models with covariates, we are concerned with the following L-functional and its estimation:

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \int_0^1 \beta_0(\tau) d\mu(\tau), \quad (1.8)$$

where $\beta_0(\tau)$ is the unknown true regression quantile for a fix $\tau \in [0, 1]$ which is defined as:

$$\beta_0(\tau) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{E} (\rho_\tau (Y - \mathbf{x}^T \beta)). \quad (1.9)$$

Here, \mathcal{B} is the parameter space of β , $\rho_\tau(u) = (\tau - \mathbf{1}(u \leq 0))u$, \mathcal{E} denotes the conditional expectation corresponding to $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$. For details on the L-estimation in the linear regression model, see [33], [4], [23] and a few relevant references therein. Finally, to estimate \mathcal{L}_0 , one may consider the following type of estimator of \mathcal{L}_0 defined in (1.8):

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_n = \int_0^1 \hat{\beta}_n(\tau) d\mu(\tau), \quad (1.10)$$

where $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$ is an estimator of $\beta_0(\tau)$ defined as:

$$\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) \in \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{E}_n (\rho_\tau (Y - \mathbf{x}^T \beta)). \quad (1.11)$$

Here, \mathcal{E}_n denotes the expectation corresponding to the empirical distribution F_n of $F_{Y|\mathbf{X}}$. In general, the readers may look at [17] for details on regression quantiles associated with general regression model like time varying regression model, and for classical regression quantiles, the readers may referred to [31], [8], [15], [14], [32] and the relevant references therein.

Our contribution: In this work, we propose the estimation of L-functional defined in (1.8) for the linear regression models associated with censored data described in (1.2) using two-stage procedures. In the first stage, using the concept of instrumental variable regression, we remove the endogeneity, and in the second stage, we estimate the unknown parameters involved in the modified model by the L-estimation technique. In the course of this study, we establish its asymptotic properties, such as consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed L-estimators, under some regularity conditions. As L-estimators are defined as certain averages of regression quantiles, some results of the regression quantiles associated with the modified model (1.2) are derived, which are potential results by their own worth. Moreover, the performance of the proposed class of estimators is investigated for various simulated and real data. Furthermore, as the errors are allowed to be dependent random variables, this methodology can be useful for dependent data such as various time series data.

Challenges: Before closing this section, it may be an appropriate place to mention that the model described in (1.2) is entirely different from the usual multiple linear regression model, and hence, the mathematical treatments of L-estimator considered here (see Section 2.2) is entirely different too than the usual L-estimators of the unknown parameters involved in the usual regression model. In order to deal with the complications involved in model (1.2) and to investigate the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimator, an advanced technique of empirical process is used. For sake of better presentation, the mathematical challenges in implementing the concept of L-estimators of the unknown parameters associated with (1.2) are thoroughly discussed in the first two paragraphs in Section 3.

The rest of the article is organized as follows: The proposed two-step estimation procedure is articulated in Section 2. Section 2.1 describes the control function approach used to address the endogeneity issue in linear regression model for censored data, and Section 2.2 extends the formulation of L-functional and its estimation procedure for the same model. The asymptotic results along with the regularity conditions are articulated in Section 3. Simulation studies are presented in Section 4 to demonstrate the consistency of estimates of L-functionals, and a benchmark real data is analysed in Section 5. We conclude the article with some concluding remarks in Section 6. Finally, proofs of the main theoretical results are given in the Appendix 7.

The R codes of simulated and real data study are available at <https://github.com/swati-1602/CRML.git>.

1.1 Notations

We adhere to [48]’s notation for empirical processes.

- For $\mathbb{W} = (y, x, w, e)$, $\mathcal{E}_n[f(\mathbb{W})] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbb{W}_i)$ is the empirical average at f , and $\mathbb{G}_n[f(\mathbb{W})] = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(\mathbb{W}_i) - \mathcal{E}[f(\mathbb{W}_i)])$ is the empirical process evaluated at same function f . Here W_1, \dots, W_n are i.i.d. copies of W .
- If \hat{f} is an estimated function, $\mathbb{G}_n[f(\mathbb{W})] = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(\mathbb{W}_i) - \mathcal{E}[f(\mathbb{W}_i)])_{f=\hat{f}}$.
- “ \Rightarrow ” represents convergence in distribution, and $l^\infty(\mathcal{T})$ denotes set of all uniformly bounded real functions on \mathcal{T} .
- For any $\{X_n, n \geq 1\}$ and $\{Y_n, n \geq 1\}$, we define the following:
 - $X_n = o_p(Y_n)$ if $\frac{X_n}{Y_n} \xrightarrow{p} 0$.
 - $X_n = O_p(Y_n)$ if $\forall \epsilon^* > 0, \exists m_0 \ \& \ n_0 \in N$ such that $p \left[\left| \frac{X_n}{Y_n} \right| \leq m_0 \right] \leq 1 - \epsilon^* \ \forall n \geq n_0$.
- “.” represents the product.

2 Methodology

We adopt a two-stage estimation procedure to estimate the parameters of the model described in (1.2). In the first stage, we employ the instrumental variable regression approach to remove the effect of endogenous variables on the parameter estimates. Subsequently, in the second stage, we define a class of estimators that are analogous to L-estimators in linear regression models associated with censored data.

2.1 The Instrumental Variables Estimation Technique

The instrumental variable (IV) estimation technique is the standard method for estimating a regression model's parameters when one or more endogenous regressors are present. This approach uses instruments, or instrumental variables, to remove endogeneity at the first stage. Subsequently, the parameters involved in the model are estimated in the next stage using an appropriate estimation technique. It is imperative to assume the validity of the instruments while using the instrumental variable approach. If an instrument is both exogenous and correlated with the endogenous variables, it is considered a valid instrument. In these cases, endogeneity is removed from the model using instrumental variables based on the instrumental variables technique (see, e.g., [45], [37], and [41]).

Let Z be an instrumental variable for the endogenous variable W (see model (1.2)), and we have n observation z_1, \dots, z_n on Z . The instrumental variables technique proceeds along the following steps. In the first step, one regress endogenous variable w_i on the instrumental variable z_i using least squares methodology, i.e.,

$$w_i = z_i \delta_1 + \vartheta_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.1)$$

where δ_1 is the unknown parameter associated with the instrumental variable Z , and ϑ_i is the random error satisfying $\mathcal{E}(\vartheta_i|z_i) = 0$, and ϵ_i and ϑ_i both are independent of z_i . Then, the idea is to control the source of endogeneity using the function $\mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i|\vartheta_i)$, called the control function. In the second step, decompose the error ϵ_i in the model described in (1.2) as follows:

$$\epsilon_i = \mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i|\vartheta_i) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.2)$$

where ε_i is the random deviation of $\mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i|\vartheta_i)$ from ϵ_i . It should be noted that $\mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i|\vartheta_i) \neq 0$ in (2.2) as a consequence of w_i being endogenous. Since using the fact that w_i is endogenous along with (2.1), we have $cov(\epsilon_i, \vartheta_i) = \mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i \vartheta_i) \neq 0$ implying $\mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i|\vartheta_i) \neq 0$. Now, observe that the functional form of $\mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i|\vartheta_i)$ is not known, in general. For the sake of technicalities, it is commonly chosen to be linear. Let us consider, $\mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i|\vartheta_i) = \rho_{10} \vartheta_i$, then (2.2) reduced in the following way:

$$\epsilon_i = \rho_{10} \vartheta_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.3)$$

where ρ_{10} is an unknown parameter in (2.3).

The gist of the aforesaid approach is to incorporate the control function in the original model (see (1.2)) to account for endogeneity and use ε_i as the error term instead of ϵ_i . Notice that the error ϵ_i in the original model is decomposed (see (2.2)) in such a way that $cov(\varepsilon_i, \vartheta_i) = 0$ so that all the variation in ϵ_i due to ϑ_i is subsumed into $\mathcal{E}(\epsilon_i|\vartheta_i)$. Consequently, the following transformed model will be free from endogeneity that can be estimated using any suitable technique.

$$y_i = \max\{0, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + w_i \gamma_0 + \rho_{10} \vartheta_i + \varepsilon_i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.4)$$

Note that the model described in (2.4) contains an unobserved random component as one of the regressors. Therefore, it is necessary to replace ϑ_i by the residuals of the model in (2.1) to estimate the parameters

of the model (2.4). Now, let e_1, \dots, e_n denote the residuals of the model in (2.1), then the model in (2.4) reduces to the following model:

$$y_i = \max\{0, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + w_i \gamma_0 + e_i \rho_{10} + \varepsilon_i\} = \max\{0, \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \varepsilon_i\}. \quad (2.5)$$

In this case, $\mathbf{x}_i = [\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T, w_i, e_i]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = [\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \gamma_0, \rho_{10}]^T$ with $m = p + 2$ is the $(m \times 1)$ -dimensional vector of unknown parameters. Next, the estimation of the parameters in the model (2.5) is described.

2.2 The Class of L-estimators

Given a vector of regressors \mathbf{x} and the response variable Y , the conditional quantile function corresponding to the model (1.2) is represented by $\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{x}}$ and defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{x}}(\tau) = F_{Y|\mathbf{x}}^{-1}(\tau) = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R} : F_{Y|\mathbf{x}}(t) \geq \tau\}, \quad \tau \in (0, 1),$$

where $F_{Y|\mathbf{x}}$ denotes the cumulative conditional distribution function of Y given \mathbf{x} . The class of L-estimators of the parameters involved in the model (2.5) is based on the estimators studied by [39]. For that model, under the assumption of integrability, the τ -th quantile of true unknown parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)$ solves

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{E}(\rho_\tau(Y - \max(0, \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}))). \quad (2.6)$$

Here $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \gamma, \rho_1)^T$, \mathcal{B} is the parameter space of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and $\rho_\tau(u) = (\tau - \mathbb{1}(u \leq 0))u$. The expectation corresponding to the conditional distribution function of Y given \mathbf{x} is represented by \mathcal{E} . In view of the equivariance properties of the quantile function to monotone transformation, quantile function under censoring is as follows:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{x}}(\tau) = F_{Y|\mathbf{x}}^{-1}(\tau) = \max\{0, \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathcal{Q}(\tau)\}, \quad \tau \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}(\tau)$ indicates the τ -th quantile function of random error ε_i . Additionally, if the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ encompasses the intercept term, then τ -th quantile function of Y given \mathbf{x} can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{Y|\mathbf{x}}(\tau) = F_{Y|\mathbf{x}}^{-1}(\tau) = \max\{0, \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\}, \quad \tau \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathcal{Q}(\tau)e$, $e = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$, is formulated as a function of τ , is the true unknown parameter vector of censored regression coefficients. Then, the censored quantile estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)$ is defined as follows:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) \in \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{Q}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau), \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\tau(y_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\tau(y_i - \max\{0, \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}\}). \quad (2.10)$$

Moreover, in the context of the model described in (2.5), we define the censored quantile process as follows:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) = \{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau), \tau \in \mathcal{T} \subset (0, 1)\}. \quad (2.11)$$

Here, \mathcal{T} is a closed subinterval of $(0, 1)$, denoted as $[\tau_0, 1 - \tau_0]$, for some $\tau_0 > 0$. A wide class of estimators called as smooth L-estimators, denoted by

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \int_0^1 \hat{\beta}_n(\tau) J(\tau) d\tau, \quad (2.12)$$

where $J(\tau)$ is a bounded measurable on $[0, 1]$ and vanishes outside of the subinterval \mathcal{T} . The corresponding population version, denoted by \mathcal{L}_0 , is

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \int_0^1 \beta_0(\tau) J(\tau) d\tau. \quad (2.13)$$

Observe that various choices of $J(\cdot)$ in (2.12) and (2.13) will provide various sample and population versions of L-estimators, which are later on considered in simulation studies (see in Section 4). Section 3 investigates the asymptotic properties of \mathcal{L}_n after appropriate normalization.

3 Main Results

This section establishes the consistency and asymptotic normality of \mathcal{L}_n defined in (2.12). Generally speaking, applying the L-estimation technique to the model defined in (2.5) encounters a significant challenge: Observe that the objective function in (2.10) need not be convex and differentiable with respect to β . Consequently, concerns about the identifiability of the true parameter $\beta_0(\tau)$ are raised by the non-convex nature of $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau)$ (see, (2.10)). For example, consider the case when all the observations are censored, that is, $y_i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. In such a case, $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau) = 0$ for any $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ for which $\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta \leq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore, the quantile loss function $\rho_\tau(\cdot, \cdot)$ is always non-negative, and hence, any value $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ that satisfies $\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta \leq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ serves as a minimizer of $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau)$. Thus, $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$ is not unique, and the true unknown parameter $\beta_0(\tau)$ is not identifiable in this case.

In the scenario described above, the true parameter vector $\beta_0(\tau)$ is not identifiable without imposing additional constraints on the distribution of the error term ε_i . To address it, we assume that the error distribution is absolutely continuous and possesses a positive density at the τ -th quantile of ε_i . This implies that the τ -th quantile of ε_i is uniquely defined. Moreover, to ensure that the conditional quantile function defined in (2.10) provides informative insights about the parameter vector, it is necessary that the true regression function $\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_0 + \mathcal{Q}(\tau) > 0$ remains positive for a significant proportion of the sample. Therefore, if $\hat{\beta}_n$ is to be consistent, then the true regression function $\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_0(\tau)$ must predominantly be non-negative for a significant proportion of the sample. As emphasized in [39], addressing the issue of non-identifiability of $\beta_0(\tau)$, entails imposing constraints on the behavior of the true regression function $\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_0(\tau)$. Specifically, it is essential that for large enough number of observations, $\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_0(\tau) > 0$, and the regressors are not collinear. This requirement is explicitly formalized in the assumption A.3 (see Section 3.1).

3.1 Strong Consistency of \mathcal{L}_n

We establish the consistency of \mathcal{L}_n under the following assumptions on the parameter space, errors, regressors, and the true regression function. As per requirements in understanding the technical assumptions, we here briefly discuss the notion of mixing dependent random variables, and the notations used in this description are self-content.

Suppose that $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a sequence of identically distributed random variables, and for any $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 \leq a \leq b < \infty$, let us denote $\mathcal{F}_a^b = \sigma(X_a, X_{a+1}, \dots, X_b)$ and $\mathcal{F}_m^\infty = \sigma(X_m, X_{m+1}, \dots)$, where $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the smallest σ -field generated by the random variables mentioned inside (\cdot) . Note that if \mathcal{F}_1^k and \mathcal{F}_{k+n}^∞ are independent, then $P(A \cap B) - P(A)P(B) = 0$ for any $A \in \mathcal{F}_1^k$ and $B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+n}^\infty$. Let us quantify the dependence structure of the stationary sequence of random variables $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ using \mathcal{F}_1^k and \mathcal{F}_{k+n}^∞ . Suppose that

$$\psi(n) = \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(A)P(B)} - 1 \right| : A \in \mathcal{F}_1^k, B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+n}^\infty, k = 1, 2, \dots \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Note that $\psi_n = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if the sequence of random variables $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are mutually independent, and the order of ψ_n with respect to n indicates the strength of the dependence among the random variables in the sequence $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$.

Now, recall the model (2.5), and all of the assumptions discussed below are based on it.

Assumptions:

- A.1** The parameter space \mathcal{B} defined in (2.6) is a compact space, and for each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\beta_0(\tau) \in \mathcal{B}^\circ$. Here \mathcal{T} is a closed subinterval of $(0, 1)$, $\beta_0(\tau)$ is the same as defined in (2.6), and \mathcal{B}° is the interior of $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$.
- A.2** Let f_{ε_1} denote the probability density function of ε_1 , where f_{ε_1} is strictly positive and bounded above. Moreover, $\phi(\tau) := f_{\varepsilon_i}(\mathcal{Q}(\tau))$, and its derivative $\phi'(\tau)$ is uniformly bounded for $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{Q}(\tau)$ is the same as defined in (2.10). Furthermore, for the random variables $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ defined in (2.5), $\mathcal{E}(\varepsilon_1^2) < \infty$, and $\psi(n) = O\left(n^{\frac{2r}{r-2}}\right)$, where $r > 2$ is a fixed constant, and $\psi(\cdot)$ is the same as defined in (3.1).
- A.3** There exists a constant K_0 such that $\|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq K_0$ almost surely. Moreover, for some positive $\epsilon_0 > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n(\tau) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_0(\tau) \geq \epsilon_0) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \right] = Q, \quad (3.2)$$

where Q is a uniformly positive definite matrix in the sense that the minimum eigen value of Q is bounded away from zero, for all τ .

- A.4** The support of $J(\cdot)$ is a compact subinterval of $(0, 1)$, and $J(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on that compact subinterval

Remark 3.1. As required by Lemma 7.1, A.1 guarantees the existence and measurability of $\hat{\beta}_n$ as well as the uniformity of the almost sure convergence of the minimand over \mathcal{B} . The assumption A.2 implies that errors are coming from a continuous distribution with density uniformly bounded in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Further, A.2 allows the identically distributed dependent errors as long as the second moment of the error random variable is finite. In fact, for various choices of $\psi(\cdot)$, a wide range of dependence among the error random variables is applicable here. Assumption A.3 is the same as the full rank condition described in [39] and [44], except that it is a uniform over the $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Assumption A.4 is common in practice, and it is the same as the condition considered in [33].

Theorem 3.1 describes the uniform convergence of $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$ to $\beta_0(\tau)$, which is a valuable result by its own worth.

Theorem 3.1. For the model described in (2.5), under A.1 – A.3, we have

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Here $m = p + 2$, $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$ is the same as defined in (2.9), and $\beta_0(\tau)$ is the same as defined in (2.6).

Proof. See Appendix. □

Theorem 3.2 describes the strong consistency of \mathcal{L}_n to \mathcal{L}_0 .

Theorem 3.2. For the model described in (2.5), under A.1 – A.4, we have

$$\|\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Here \mathcal{L}_n is the same as defined in (2.12), and \mathcal{L}_0 is the same as defined in (2.13).

Proof. See Appendix. □

3.2 Asymptotic Normality of \mathcal{L}_n

This section investigates the asymptotic normality of \mathcal{L}_n after appropriate normalization, and a few more assumptions along with the earlier assumptions (A1) to (A4) are required.

A.5 $\beta_0(\tau)$ is Lipschitz in τ such that $\|\beta_0(\tau') - \beta_0(\tau'')\| \leq c_0 \|\tau' - \tau''\|$, where c_0 is some constant.

A.6 For some constants $K_1 > 0$ and $\zeta_0 > 0$, and for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, the random vector \mathbf{x}_i defined in (2.5), under the condition $\|\beta - \beta_0(\tau)\| < \zeta_0$, satisfy the following inequality for all $0 \leq z^* < \zeta_0$, and $r = 0, 1, 2$:

$$\mathcal{E} [\mathbf{1} (|\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta| \leq \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \cdot z^*) \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^r] \leq K_1 \cdot z^*.$$

Remark 3.2. Assumption A.5 implies that censored quantile regression coefficients are sufficiently smooth with respect to the quantile index. This is a reasonable assumption when the conditional distribution of y^* given \mathbf{x} is sufficiently smooth. Further, when for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} > 0$, with probability 1, then A.6 holds uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, under some smoothness condition on the distribution of \mathbf{x}_i .

Theorem 3.3 describes the weak convergence of the censored quantile stochastic process defined in (2.11), which is worthy to investigate by its own importance, and moreover, the assertion of this theorem is the key step to have the asymptotic distribution of \mathcal{L}_n after appropriate normalization.

Theorem 3.3. For the model described in (2.5), under A.1 – A.3, A.5 and A.6 along with $\psi(n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) \Rightarrow \mathbb{G}(\cdot), \text{ in } l^\infty(\mathcal{T}),$$

where $\mathbb{G}(\cdot)$ is centered Gaussian process with covariance function

$$\mathcal{E}[\mathbb{G}(\tau)\mathbb{G}(\tau_1)^T] = \mathbb{D}^{-1}(\tau)\mathbb{H}(\tau, \tau_1)[\mathbb{D}^{-1}(\tau_1)]^T,$$

where $\mathbb{D}(\tau) = [f_\varepsilon(Q(\tau))\mathbb{M}(\tau)]$, $\mathbb{H}(\tau, \tau_1) = [\min\{\tau, \tau_1\} - \tau\tau_1] \cdot \mathbb{M}(\tau)$ and for $\tau < \tau_1$,

$$\mathbb{M}(\tau) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}} [\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T]. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. See Appendix. □

Remark 3.3. An implication of Theorem 3.3 is that for any given τ , we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) \Rightarrow Z,$$

where Z is a \mathbb{R}^m valued random vector associated with a m -dimensional multivariate normal distribution, with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\mathbb{D}^{-1}(\tau)\mathbb{H}(\tau, \tau)[\mathbb{D}^{-1}(\tau)]^T$. Next, suppose that for any finite collection of quantile indices $\{\tau_i, i = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}\}$, the vector of k regression quantile estimator is represented by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau_1), \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau_k))^T$, and the corresponding vector of true unknown regression quantiles is represented by $\boldsymbol{\xi}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau_1), \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau_k))^T$. Then

$$\mathbb{S}_n^{-1/2} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_n - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) \Rightarrow Z^*,$$

where Z^* is a \mathbb{R}^{mk} valued random vector associated with a standard m -dimensional multivariate normal distribution. Here $\mathbb{S}_n^{-1/2}$ is a square root of matrix \mathbb{S}_n which can be written as $\mathbb{S}_n = [w_{lj}Q_p]$ for $p = \max\{l, j\}$ and $l, j = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, where

$$w_{lj} = \frac{\min\{\tau_l, \tau_j\} - \tau_l \tau_j}{f_\varepsilon[Q(\tau_l)] \cdot f_\varepsilon[Q(\tau_j)]},$$

and

$$Q_{j^*} = \mathcal{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau_{j^*}) \geq \epsilon_0) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \right], j^* = 1, \dots, k.$$

Finally, Theorem 3.4 describes the asymptotic distribution of \mathcal{L}_n after appropriate normalization, which is the key result of this work.

Theorem 3.4. *For the model described in (2.5), under A.1 – A.6 along with $\psi(n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}_{n,i} + o_p(1),$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{n,i}$ is a \mathbb{R}^m valued random vector. The exact expressions : $\mathbf{v}_{n,i} = \mathbf{A}_{n,i} \mathbf{x}_i$ where

$$\mathbf{A}_{n,i} = \int_0^1 [\mathbb{D}_n^{-1}(\tau) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0) \{\tau - \mathbf{1}(\varepsilon_i \leq \mathcal{Q}(\tau))\}] J(\tau) d\tau.$$

Consequently,

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0) \Rightarrow Z_1,$$

where Z_1 is a \mathbb{R}^m valued random vector associated with a m -dimensional multivariate normal distribution, with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix

$$\Sigma = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \mathbb{D}^{-1}(t) \mathbb{H}(t, s) \mathbb{D}^{-1}(s) J(t) J(s) dt ds. \quad (3.4)$$

Here $\mathbb{D}(t)$ and $\mathbb{H}(t, s)$ are the same as defined in Theorem 3.3.

Proof. See Appendix. □

Remark 3.4. *Observe that the assertion in Theorem 3.4 includes the condition $\psi(n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies that errors are considered to be independent random variables, whereas the the assertion in Theorem 3.1 does not need such assumption. In a nutshell, the consistency of the proposed estimator holds for certain dependent errors as well. However, the asymptotic normality of the proposed estimator after appropriate normalization requires i.i.d. errors, although a careful inspection suggests that the result of asymptotic normality is expected to be true for certain dependent errors as well.*

Remark 3.5. *In order to implement the assertion in Theorem 3.4 in practice, one needs to consistently estimate Σ described in the statement of this theorem.*

3.3 Consistent Estimator of Σ

As we mentioned in Remark 3.5, for a given data, one needs to estimate Σ consistently to implement the asymptotic distribution stated in Theorem 3.4. Let $\hat{\Sigma}_n$ be an estimator of Σ , which is defined as follows:

$$\hat{\Sigma}_n = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \hat{\mathbb{D}}_n^{-1}(t) \hat{\mathbb{H}}_n(t, s) \hat{\mathbb{D}}_n^{-1}(s) J(t) J(s) dt ds, \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbb{D}}_n(\cdot) = \frac{n^{-1}}{2h_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\cdot) > 0) \cdot \mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\cdot)| \leq h_n) \cdot \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \right], \quad (3.6)$$

where h_n is a sequence of n such that $h_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $nh_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For all $0 \leq t < s \leq 1$,

$$\hat{H}_n(t, s) = (t - ts)\mathcal{E}_n[\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\cdot) > 0) \cdot \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T]. \quad (3.7)$$

Now, Theorem 3.5 asserts the strong consistency of $\hat{\Sigma}_n$ to Σ .

Theorem 3.5. *Under the conditions (A1)–(A6) along with $\psi(n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|\hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma\| = o(1)$$

almost surely, where $\hat{\Sigma}_n$ and Σ are the same as defined in (3.5) and (3.4), respectively.

Proof. See Appendix. □

Next, Corollary 1 follows from the assertions in Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.4.

Corollary 1. *Under the conditions (A1)–(A6) along with $\psi(n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sqrt{n\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0) \Rightarrow Z_2,$$

where Z_2 is a \mathbb{R}^m valued random vector associated with standard m -dimensional multivariate normal distribution.

Proof. See Appendix. □

Remark 3.6. *In order to implement any statistical methodology based on the asymptotic properties of \mathcal{L}_n , one may employ the result stated in Corollary 1 as $\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is computable for a given data.*

4 Finite Sample Simulation Studies

The asymptotic properties of the estimator gives an idea about the behaviour of the estimator when the sample size is large. To study and understand the behaviour of the proposed estimators in finite samples, we conduct a Monte Carlo simulation study.

The data on y_i^* ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is generated from the model:

$$y_i^* = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \beta_2 w_i + \epsilon_i, \quad (4.1)$$

and the data on the endogenous variable w_i is generated using

$$w_i = \alpha z_i + \nu_i, \quad (4.2)$$

where the random errors ν_i are generated from $N(0, 1)$, while z_i is considered as the fixed observations from the $U(0, 1)$. Afterwards, the observations on w_i are generated for given values of $\alpha = 1$. To address

endogeneity within the model, we employ the instrumental variable estimation techniques (see Section 2.1) and decompose the error term ϵ_i in (4.1) into two distinct components as:

$$\epsilon_i = \rho_1 \nu_i + \varepsilon_i. \quad (4.3)$$

The random errors ϵ_i are generated using the relationship provided in (4.3) for the given ρ_1 and the observations on ε_i . Then y_i is generated using

$$y_i = \max(0, y_i^*) = \max(0, \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \beta_2 w_i + \rho_1 \nu_i + \varepsilon_i). \quad (4.4)$$

In this study, we choose $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \rho_1) = (1, 2, 3, 0.5)$ and generate exogenous regressors x_i from $N(0, 1)$. We consider three different choices for the errors: standard normal distribution denoted as $N(0, 1)$, standard Cauchy distribution denoted as $C(0, 1)$, and Student's t -distribution with 3 degrees of freedom denoted as (t_3) . The following cases are considered when the errors are independent random variables.

Case 1: Independent Errors

Example 1 (α -trimmed mean): Let $J(\tau) = \frac{1}{1-2\alpha}$, where $\alpha < \tau < 1 - \alpha$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. Then, the corresponding \mathcal{L}_n (see (2.12)) estimator takes the following form:

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \frac{1}{1-2\alpha} \int_{\alpha}^{1-\alpha} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) d\tau. \quad (4.5)$$

Example 2 (α -Winsorized mean): Let $J(\tau) = 1$, where $\alpha < \tau < 1 - \alpha$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. Then, the corresponding \mathcal{L}_n estimator takes the following form:

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \int_{\alpha}^{1-\alpha} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) d\tau + \alpha(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\alpha) + \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(1 - \alpha)). \quad (4.6)$$

Example 3: Let $J(\tau) = 6\tau(1 - \tau)$, where $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$. Then, the corresponding \mathcal{L}_n estimator takes the following form:

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \int_0^1 6\tau(1 - \tau) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) d\tau. \quad (4.7)$$

Here, we use $\alpha = \{0.01, 0.02, 0.20\}$ in Examples 1 and 2, and $\beta_0(\tau)$, $\beta_1(\tau)$, $\beta_2(\tau)$, and $\rho_1(\tau)$ in (4.4) are computed using the “`quantreg`” function in R software. All the R codes for the simulated data study were executed on the server in the Linux operating system. The following steps are summarized for evaluating the integral involved in \mathcal{L}_n .

- Generate M many random observations $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_m\}$ from $U(0, 1)$.
- For each sample τ_j , estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \rho_1)^T$ using quantile regression.
- The integral $\mathcal{L}_n = (\mathcal{L}_{n0}, \mathcal{L}_{n1}, \mathcal{L}_{n2}, \mathcal{L}_{n3})^T \in \mathbb{R}^4$ defined in (2.12) is approximated by

$$\mathcal{L}_n \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau_j) J(\tau_j),$$

and \mathcal{L}_0 is approximated by

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \approx \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \beta(\tau_j) J(\tau_j).$$

As the estimates were getting converged with 2000 replications, we repeated this experiment $r = 2000$ times for the sample size $n \in \{50, 75, 100, 200, 500, 700, 1000\}$. Observe that $\mathcal{L}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^4$, and for that reason, the componentwise empirical bias (Ebias) and componentwise empirical mean squared error (EMSE) of the parameter estimates of

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = (\mathcal{L}_0, \mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \mathcal{L}_3)^T$$

are computed as follows:

$$\text{Ebias}(\mathcal{L}_j) \approx \frac{1}{r} \sum_{k=1}^r (\mathcal{L}_{njk} - \mathcal{L}_j), j = 0, 1, 2, 3$$

and

$$\text{EMSE}(\mathcal{L}_j) \approx \frac{1}{r} \sum_{k=1}^r (\mathcal{L}_{njk} - \mathcal{L}_j)^2, j = 0, 1, 2, 3$$

where \mathcal{L}_{njk} is the estimate of \mathcal{L}_{nj} ($j = 0, 1, 2, 3$) for the k -th replicate, where $k = 1, \dots, r$. For these designs, the overall censoring probabilities are varied between 24% to 44%, and it is observed that the different censoring percentages do not change the qualitative conclusions. Tables 1-7 present the Ebias and EMSE of the proposed estimators with censored observations for different sample sizes across the three examples. To maintain brevity, the Ebias and EMSE are only reported for sample sizes $n \in \{50, 100, 500, 1000\}$.

The findings indicate that for small sample sizes and lower values of α , the EMSEs of the estimators are lower in the cases of $N(0, 1)$ and t_3 distributions of errors, whereas the EMSEs are significantly higher in the case of the Cauchy distribution in all three examples. It is observed that the choice of α influences EMSE, e.g., $\alpha = 0.2$ results in lower EMSE compared to $\alpha = 0.01$ or 0.02 . Notably, due to their lower sensitivity to outliers, the α -trimmed mean outperform the others. As the sample sizes increase to $n = 500$ and 1000 , the Ebias and EMSE of the proposed estimators decrease across all error distributions, irrespective of the values of α . This aligns with the findings from the proposed estimators, which are consistent.

The graphical results for EMSE are summarized in Figures 1-3, which indicate that the proposed estimator \mathcal{L}_n performs well for the examples considered here. It is clearly observed that the EMSE decreases as the trimming proportion α increases. Particularly for heavy-tailed distributions like Cauchy distribution and t distribution with 3 degrees of freedom, the same phenomenon indicates that \mathcal{L}_n can be a useful estimator when the data are consisting of some outliers. The similar observation holds for the magnitude of Ebias also.

Case 2: Dependent Errors

To introduce the dependent error structure, consider an auto-regressive process of first order as

$$\varepsilon_i = \rho^* \varepsilon_{i-1} + \eta_i, i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (4.8)$$

where $|\rho^*| \leq 1$ is the autocorrelation coefficient, and η_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) are independent and identically distributed random variables that follow $N(0, \sigma^2)$, see [53] for discussion on such models. In this numerical study, ε_i s are generated using the model (4.8) with $\rho^* = 0.5$ and the observations $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n\}$.

The following examples are considered for the dependent error structure:

Example 4: Let $J(\tau) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, where $\alpha < \tau < 1 - \alpha$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. The corresponding \mathcal{L}_n is the same as \mathcal{L}_n in Example 1.

Example 5: Let $J(\tau) = 1$, where $\alpha < \tau < 1 - \alpha$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. The corresponding \mathcal{L}_n is the same as \mathcal{L}_n in Example 2.

Example 6: Let $J(\tau) = 6\tau(1 - \tau)$, where $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$. The corresponding \mathcal{L}_n is the same as \mathcal{L}_n in Example 3.

The summarized outcomes are presented in Tables 8, 10 and in Figure 4. We observe from these results that the proposed estimator \mathcal{L}_n performs the best across the considered examples. As the trimming proportion α increases, the EMSE and Ebias decrease and the rate of decrement is higher in larger sample sizes. Overall, it can be concluded that \mathcal{L}_n is useful in the case of correlated/dependent data with censored observations also.

Table 1: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 1 for $\alpha = 0.01$ with censored probabilities (CP).

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0861 | 0.0074 | | 0.0683 | 0.0046 | | -0.0161 | 0.0006 | | -0.0215 | 0.0002 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2496 | 0.0623 | 38% | -0.1474 | 0.0217 | 35% | -0.0230 | 0.0050 | 37% | -0.0083 | 0.0010 | 30% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | -0.0022 | 0.0161 | | 0.0024 | 0.0148 | | 0.0013 | 0.0047 | | 0.0008 | 0.0030 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0329 | 0.0047 | | 0.0123 | 0.0001 | | 0.0014 | 0.0002 | | 0.0007 | 0.0002 | |
| $C(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.9223 | 0.8507 | | -0.2930 | 0.0858 | | -0.6809 | 0.0337 | | -0.2899 | 0.0289 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.5468 | 0.2990 | 32% | 0.2398 | 0.0575 | 41% | 0.0404 | 0.0016 | 37% | 0.0465 | 0.0010 | 34% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.6309 | 0.6980 | | 0.8132 | 0.6614 | | 0.3965 | 0.1572 | | 0.1916 | 0.0367 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.4929 | 0.2429 | | 0.1742 | 0.0303 | | -0.0882 | 0.0077 | | -0.0111 | 0.0001 | |
| t_3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0826 | 0.0068 | | 0.0495 | 0.0024 | | 0.0038 | 0.0017 | | 0.0142 | 0.0002 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2704 | 0.0731 | 34% | -0.1717 | 0.0294 | 25% | -0.0403 | 0.0016 | 35% | -0.0204 | 0.0004 | 32% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0331 | 0.0011 | | 0.0278 | 0.0007 | | 0.0092 | 0.0042 | | 0.0052 | 0.0008 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0520 | 0.0027 | | 0.0229 | 0.0005 | | 0.0042 | 0.0003 | | 0.0020 | 0.0001 | |

Table 2: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 1 for $\alpha = 0.02$ with censored probabilities (CP).

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0776 | 0.0060 | | 0.0696 | 0.0048 | | 0.0242 | 0.0005 | | 0.0301 | 0.0002 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2419 | 0.0585 | 32% | -0.1396 | 0.0195 | 32% | -0.0193 | 0.0041 | 33% | -0.0059 | 0.0011 | 33% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | -0.0016 | 0.0067 | | 0.0026 | 0.0070 | | 0.0011 | 0.0035 | | 0.0007 | 0.0014 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0310 | 0.0009 | | 0.0111 | 0.0001 | | 0.0012 | 0.0005 | | 0.0007 | 0.0003 | |
| $C(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.4549 | 0.2069 | | -0.3987 | 0.1590 | | -0.2745 | 0.0753 | | -0.2850 | 0.0719 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.1480 | 0.0219 | 32% | -0.1247 | 0.0155 | 44% | 0.0007 | 0.0047 | 34% | 0.0227 | 0.00 | 35% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 1.4129 | 1.9962 | | 0.4929 | 0.2430 | | 0.1564 | 0.0244 | | 0.1270 | 0.0161 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | -0.4612 | 0.2127 | | 0.1007 | 0.0101 | | -0.0007 | 0.0052 | | -0.0025 | 0.0028 | |
| t_3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0571 | 0.0032 | | 0.0038 | 0.0010 | | -0.0247 | 0.0006 | | 0.0110 | 0.0002 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2648 | 0.0701 | 30% | -0.1659 | 0.0275 | 32% | -0.0352 | 0.0012 | 35% | -0.0159 | 0.0002 | 33% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0302 | 0.0095 | | 0.0218 | 0.0040 | | 0.0060 | 0.0027 | | 0.0032 | 0.0011 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0482 | 0.0023 | | 0.0207 | 0.0005 | | 0.0030 | 0.0002 | | 0.0013 | 0.0002 | |

Table 3: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 1 for $\alpha = 0.20$ with censored probabilities (CP).

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0773 | 0.0279 | | 0.0437 | 0.0059 | | 0.0025 | 0.0019 | | 0.0144 | 0.0002 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.1942 | 0.0661 | 44% | -0.1044 | 0.0191 | 34% | -0.0099 | 0.0179 | 33% | -0.0026 | 0.0070 | 32% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | -0.0021 | 0.0115 | | 0.0012 | 0.0061 | | 0.0010 | 0.0038 | | 0.0005 | 0.0024 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0195 | 0.0663 | | 0.0058 | 0.0105 | | 0.0007 | 0.0032 | | 0.0004 | 0.0018 | |
| $C(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | -0.0105 | 0.0239 | | 0.0167 | 0.0176 | | 0.0152 | 0.0109 | | 0.0059 | 0.0046 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2397 | 0.0574 | 22% | -0.1524 | 0.0346 | 35% | -0.0237 | 0.0062 | 34% | -0.0071 | 0.0025 | 34% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0491 | 0.0618 | | 0.0193 | 0.0096 | | 0.0037 | 0.0024 | | 0.0019 | 0.0003 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0503 | 0.0191 | | 0.0173 | 0.0067 | | 0.0011 | 0.0025 | | 0.0005 | 0.0004 | |
| t_3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0625 | 0.0099 | | 0.0391 | 0.0053 | | 0.0018 | 0.0023 | | -0.0014 | 0.0015 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2129 | 0.0453 | 40% | -0.1212 | 0.0244 | 33% | -0.0135 | 0.0146 | 39% | -0.0035 | 0.0023 | 32% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0050 | 0.0150 | | 0.0045 | 0.0128 | | 0.0014 | 0.0055 | | 0.0008 | 0.0021 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0260 | 0.0454 | | 0.0082 | 0.0067 | | 0.0008 | 0.0023 | | 0.0005 | 0.0003 | |

Table 4: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 2 for $\alpha = 0.01$ with censored probabilities (CP).

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.1459 | 0.0213 | | 0.0805 | 0.0064 | | 0.0446 | 0.0019 | | 0.0294 | 0.0008 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2169 | 0.0470 | 42% | -0.1162 | 0.0135 | 34% | 0.0116 | 0.0013 | 32% | 0.0284 | 0.0004 | 31% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0572 | 0.0069 | | 0.0615 | 0.0037 | | 0.0616 | 0.0018 | | 0.0609 | 0.0011 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0441 | 0.0019 | | 0.0233 | 0.0005 | | 0.0118 | 0.0001 | | 0.0106 | 0.0001 | |
| $C(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.6568 | 0.4314 | | 2.1662 | 0.6926 | | -0.1024 | 0.0104 | | -0.2384 | 0.0068 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2109 | 0.0444 | 42% | 0.1315 | 0.0173 | 37% | 0.0967 | 0.0093 | 35% | 0.1250 | 0.0056 | 37% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 1.4540 | 2.1142 | | 1.9035 | 1.6235 | | 0.4708 | 0.2217 | | 0.3407 | 0.1398 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.2771 | 0.0768 | | -0.3361 | 0.1129 | | -0.0149 | 0.0020 | | -0.0120 | 0.0013 | |
| t_3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0884 | 0.0078 | | 0.0576 | 0.0033 | | 0.0039 | 0.0016 | | -0.2384 | 0.0010 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2385 | 0.0568 | 32% | -0.1371 | 0.0188 | 31% | -0.0048 | 0.0168 | 32% | 0.1250 | 0.0156 | 37% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0978 | 0.0095 | | 0.0934 | 0.0087 | | 0.0738 | 0.0054 | | 0.3407 | 0.0030 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0637 | 0.0040 | | 0.0353 | 0.0012 | | 0.0156 | 0.0003 | | -0.0120 | 0.0002 | |

Table 5: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 2 for $\alpha = 0.02$ with censored probabilities (CP).

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.1359 | 0.0184 | | 0.1011 | 0.0102 | | 0.0504 | 0.0025 | | 0.0239 | 0.0005 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.1757 | 0.0308 | 38% | -0.0711 | 0.0050 | 32% | 0.0544 | 0.0013 | 36% | 0.0702 | 0.0004 | 33% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.1171 | 0.0257 | | 0.1218 | 0.0148 | | 0.1210 | 0.0037 | | 0.1208 | 0.0014 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0533 | 0.0028 | | 0.0337 | 0.0011 | | 0.0218 | 0.0004 | | 0.0208 | 0.0003 | |
| $C(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.6787 | 0.4606 | | 0.0359 | 0.0012 | | -0.2826 | 0.0165 | | -0.3962 | 0.0070 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.3055 | 0.0933 | 30% | 0.1431 | 0.0204 | 36% | 0.1199 | 0.0143 | 34% | 0.1320 | 0.0140 | 36% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 1.2723 | 1.6188 | | 1.0639 | 1.1320 | | 0.3889 | 0.1512 | | 0.3480 | 0.1211 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.3051 | 0.0930 | | 0.1089 | 0.0118 | | -0.0013 | 0.0044 | | 0.0021 | 0.0011 | |
| t_3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.1248 | 0.0155 | | 0.0829 | 0.0068 | | 0.0348 | 0.0012 | | -0.3962 | 0.0010 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.1993 | 0.0397 | 42% | -0.0993 | 0.0098 | 34% | 0.0346 | 0.0032 | 34% | 0.1320 | 0.0019 | 36% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.1558 | 0.0242 | | 0.1498 | 0.0224 | | 0.1304 | 0.0170 | | 0.3480 | 0.0157 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0753 | 0.0056 | | 0.0450 | 0.0020 | | 0.0240 | 0.0005 | | 0.0021 | 0.0004 | |

Table 6: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 2 for $\alpha = 0.20$. Here CP denotes the censored probabilities

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.4804 | 0.2308 | | 0.4495 | 0.2020 | | 0.4063 | 0.1651 | | 0.3999 | 0.1579 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | 0.5941 | 0.6360 | 34% | 0.6880 | 0.6195 | 20% | 0.7871 | 0.4734 | 33% | 0.7959 | 0.3529 | 31% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 1.2018 | 1.4526 | | 1.2022 | 1.3045 | | 1.2010 | 0.8328 | | 1.2010 | 0.5524 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.2185 | 0.0477 | | 0.2054 | 0.0421 | | 0.1996 | 0.0402 | | 0.2009 | 0.0311 | |
| $C(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.3031 | 0.1640 | | 0.3987 | 0.1590 | | 0.4050 | 0.1481 | | 0.4029 | 0.0919 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | 0.5586 | 0.6209 | 36% | 0.6266 | 0.5856 | 34% | 0.7652 | 0.3926 | 37% | 0.7880 | 0.3121 | 34% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 1.3136 | 1.7257 | | 1.2269 | 1.5054 | | 1.2048 | 0.8516 | | 1.2036 | 0.6386 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.2573 | 0.0662 | | 0.2300 | 0.0529 | | 0.2049 | 0.0419 | | 0.1995 | 0.0398 | |
| t_3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.4688 | 0.2198 | | 0.4494 | 0.2016 | | 0.4032 | 0.1653 | | 0.4066 | 0.1626 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | 0.5616 | 0.6276 | 34% | 0.6685 | 0.6149 | 35% | 0.7841 | 0.4470 | 34% | 0.7922 | 0.3154 | 34% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 1.2053 | 1.4626 | | 1.2094 | 1.4529 | | 1.2010 | 0.8350 | | 1.2010 | 0.7024 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.2399 | 0.0575 | | 0.2072 | 0.0429 | | 0.2007 | 0.0401 | | 0.1998 | 0.0396 | |

Table 7: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 3 with censored probabilities (CP)

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0901 | 0.0081 | | 0.0474 | 0.0022 | | -0.0016 | 0.0010 | | 0.0218 | 0.0007 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2217 | 0.0491 | 42% | -0.1137 | 0.0129 | 31% | -0.0341 | 0.0020 | 30% | 0.0245 | 0.0006 | 33% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | -0.0161 | 0.0026 | | 0.0069 | 0.0028 | | -0.0300 | 0.0016 | | 0.0434 | 0.0008 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0216 | 0.0040 | | 0.0089 | 0.0042 | | -0.0041 | 0.0008 | | 0.0076 | 0.0005 | |
| $C(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | -0.1954 | 0.0382 | | 0.0606 | 0.0036 | | -0.0550 | 0.0030 | | -0.1974 | 0.0012 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.3205 | 0.1027 | 34% | -0.1729 | 0.0218 | 27% | -0.0234 | 0.0055 | 32% | 0.0191 | 0.0030 | 37% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.3832 | 0.1469 | | 0.2682 | 0.0519 | | 0.0659 | 0.0043 | | 0.1054 | 0.0015 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.1046 | 0.0109 | | 0.0233 | 0.0025 | | 0.0034 | 0.0019 | | 0.0154 | 0.0011 | |
| t_3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.1096 | 0.0120 | | 0.1274 | 0.0102 | | -0.0193 | 0.0003 | | -0.0453 | 0.0002 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.3158 | 0.0997 | 24% | -0.1228 | 0.0151 | 40% | 0.0867 | 0.0075 | 31% | -0.0628 | 0.0039 | 35% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | -0.0727 | 0.0052 | | 0.0437 | 0.0019 | | 0.1100 | 0.0012 | | -0.0925 | 0.0008 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0191 | 0.0003 | | 0.0086 | 0.0023 | | 0.0308 | 0.0009 | | -0.0131 | 0.0003 | |

Table 8: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Examples 4-5 for $\alpha = 0.01$ and in Example 6 with censored probabilities (CP)

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $\varepsilon_i = \rho^* \varepsilon_{i-1} + \eta_i, \rho^* = 0.5, \eta_i \sim N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Example 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.1134 | 0.0128 | | 0.0462 | 0.0021 | | 0.0172 | 0.0019 | | 0.0256 | 0.0006 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2601 | 0.0676 | 34% | -0.1599 | 0.0255 | 30% | -0.0286 | 0.0047 | 34% | -0.0109 | 0.0020 | 31% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0031 | 0.0067 | | 0.0058 | 0.0042 | | 0.0024 | 0.0013 | | 0.0014 | 0.0008 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0372 | 0.0013 | | 0.0149 | 0.0006 | | 0.0016 | 0.0003 | | 0.0007 | 0.0002 | |
| Example 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.1221 | 0.0149 | | 0.0953 | 0.0075 | | 0.0493 | 0.0024 | | 0.0024 | 0.0013 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2297 | 0.0527 | 40% | -0.1293 | 0.0167 | 31% | 0.0062 | 0.0019 | 36% | 0.0255 | 0.0011 | 34% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0628 | 0.0039 | | 0.0656 | 0.0043 | | 0.0626 | 0.0039 | | 0.0614 | 0.0037 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0492 | 0.0024 | | 0.0263 | 0.0006 | | 0.0122 | 0.0005 | | 0.0108 | 0.0003 | |
| Example 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0640 | 0.0040 | | 0.0541 | 0.0028 | | -0.0133 | 0.0012 | | 0.0061 | 0.0006 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2276 | 0.0518 | 26% | -0.1399 | 0.0195 | 27% | -0.0221 | 0.0049 | 34% | -0.0057 | 0.0022 | 33% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | -0.0022 | 0.0121 | | -0.0097 | 0.0110 | | -0.0061 | 0.0029 | | 0.0001 | 0.0013 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0274 | 0.0075 | | 0.0075 | 0.0038 | | -0.0001 | 0.0012 | | 0.0004 | 0.0005 | |

Table 9: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 4 and 5 for $\alpha = 0.02$ with censored probabilities (CP).

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $\varepsilon_i = \rho^* \varepsilon_{i-1} + \eta_i, \rho^* = 0.5, \eta_i \sim N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Example 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.1067 | 0.0114 | | 0.0621 | 0.0181 | | 0.0087 | 0.0046 | | -0.0051 | 0.0006 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2528 | 0.0639 | 28% | -0.1525 | 0.0366 | 41% | -0.0243 | 0.0061 | 32% | -0.0082 | 0.0002 | 32% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0034 | 0.0243 | | 0.0060 | 0.0131 | | 0.0022 | 0.0079 | | 0.0013 | 0.0042 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0359 | 0.0181 | | 0.0135 | 0.0041 | | 0.0014 | 0.0012 | | 0.0006 | 0.0004 | |
| Example 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.1167 | 0.0136 | | 0.0980 | 0.0096 | | 0.0470 | 0.0022 | | 0.0483 | 0.0023 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2144 | 0.0459 | 28% | -0.0837 | 0.0158 | 38% | 0.0485 | 0.0046 | 28% | 0.0680 | 0.0023 | 33% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0631 | 0.0039 | | 0.1256 | 0.0157 | | 0.1226 | 0.0148 | | 0.1216 | 0.0130 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0461 | 0.0021 | | 0.0359 | 0.0012 | | 0.0214 | 0.0006 | | 0.0203 | 0.0003 | |

Table 10: Ebias and EMSE of estimates of \mathcal{L}_n in Example 4 and 5 for $\alpha = 0.20$ with censored probabilities (CP).

| Variables | $n = 50$ | | | $n = 100$ | | | $n = 500$ | | | $n = 1000$ | | |
|--|----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP | Ebias | EMSE | CP |
| $\varepsilon_i = \rho^* \varepsilon_{i-1} + \eta_i, \rho^* = 0.5, \eta_i \sim N(0, 1)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Example 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.0785 | 0.0500 | | 0.0395 | 0.0032 | | 0.0086 | 0.0015 | | 0.0004 | 0.0001 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | -0.2061 | 0.0424 | 40% | -0.1167 | 0.0228 | 34% | -0.0126 | 0.0070 | 35% | -0.0032 | 0.0016 | 35% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 0.0009 | 0.0221 | | 0.0036 | 0.0073 | | 0.0015 | 0.0062 | | 0.0008 | 0.0023 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.0234 | 0.0341 | | 0.0071 | 0.0076 | | 0.0009 | 0.0028 | | 0.0005 | 0.0001 | |
| Example 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n0} | 0.4846 | 0.2348 | | 0.4543 | 0.2064 | | 0.4005 | 0.1604 | | 0.3997 | 0.1597 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n1} | 0.5840 | 0.6357 | 38% | 0.6627 | 0.6117 | 41% | 0.7821 | 0.4391 | 34% | 0.7973 | 0.3411 | 35% |
| \mathcal{L}_{n2} | 1.1988 | 1.4544 | | 1.2021 | 1.4472 | | 1.2016 | 0.8550 | | 1.2020 | 0.6324 | |
| \mathcal{L}_{n3} | 0.2316 | 0.0536 | | 0.2106 | 0.0443 | | 0.2010 | 0.0401 | | 0.1998 | 0.0398 | |

Figure 1: Empirical MSE of parameter estimates using α -trimmed mean (see Example 1) for $\alpha = 0.01, 0.02, 0.20$ when errors follow $N(0, 1)$, $C(0, 1)$ and t_3 when $n = 50, 100, 200, \dots, 1000$




Figure 2: Empirical MSE of parameter estimates using α -Winsorized mean (see Example 2) for $\alpha = 0.01, 0.02, 0.20$ when errors follow $N(0, 1)$, $C(0, 1)$ and t_3 when $n = 50, 100, 200, \dots, 1000$




Figure 3: Empirical MSE of parameter estimates using the estimator defined in Example 3 when errors follow $N(0, 1)$, $C(0, 1)$ and t_3 for $n = 50, 100, 200, \dots, 1000$





Figure 4: Empirical MSE of parameter estimates using α -trimmed mean and α -Winsorized mean (see Example 4 – 6) for $\alpha = 0.01, 0.02, 0.20$ when errors are dependent and $n = 50, 100, 200, \dots, 1000$



5 Real Data Analysis

We analyze well-known Mroz dataset, which is included in the “Wooldridge” R package (available at <https://rdrr.io/rforge/Ecdat/man/Mroz.html>) to demonstrate the application of our proposed estimators. This dataset focuses on the labor force participation of U.S. women and includes data for 753 individuals. The response variable of interest is the total number of hours worked per week. Notably, 325 out of the 753 women reported not working any hours, rendering the dependent variable left-censored at zero. This implies that the censoring probability (CP) is of approximately 0.43.

In this dataset, the explanatory variables include the woman’s years of education (educ), years of experience (exper) along with its squared value (expersq), age (age), the number of young children under six years (kidslt6), the number of older children six years or older (kidsge6), and non-wife household income (nwfeinc). We treat non-wife household income as an endogenous variable due to its potential correlation with unobserved household preferences that could affect the wife’s labour force participation. In this study, the variable, namely, the husband’s years of education (huseduc) is considered as an instrumental variable in addressing this endogeneity. It is assumed that this variable does not directly impact the wife’s decision to enter the labour force, but it presumably affects both his income and the income of the now-wife’s household. The graphical representation in Figure 5 illustrates censored observations for the working hours of married women. The hours variable represents the total number of hours a woman worked in a year. A married woman’s maximum recorded work hours are 4950. For instance, a typical full-time job consists of 40 hours per week for 52 weeks, totaling 2080 hours each year. Thus, 4950 hours imply that the individual worked around 91 hours per week in a regular 52-week year, indicating higher labour force participation.

We obtain the estimates of the parameters and their bootstraps root mean squared error to verify the theoretical result on the real data set. The steps to compute the bootstrap root mean squared error (BRMSE) of the parameters involved in the model are described in (2.5):

- Following the same algorithm provided in Section 4, for the given data with size n , we find the approximated values of the q components of \mathcal{L}_n and denote those components as $\mathcal{L}_{n,1}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{n,q}$, where $q = 8$ and $n = 753$.
- Generate b bootstrap samples with the same sample size as the original data set.
- Compute \mathcal{L}_n for b bootstrap resamples, which are denoted as $\{\mathcal{L}_{n,1}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{n,b}\}$.
- Finally, the bootstrap root mean squared error (BRMSE) is computed as

$$BRMSE(\mathcal{L}_{n,i}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{b} \sum_{k=1}^b (\mathcal{L}_{n,i,k} - \mathcal{L}_{n,i})^2},$$

where for $i = 1, \dots, q$, $\mathcal{L}_{n,i,k}$ is the value of $\mathcal{L}_{n,i}$ for the k -th bootstrap resample ($k = 1, \dots, b$).




Figure 5: Working hours (yearly) for married women

Table 11 represents the parameter estimates for the model defined in (2.5) for the α -trimmed mean and the α -Winsorized mean defined in Section 4. These estimates are provided for $\alpha = \{0.01, 0.02, 0.20\}$. Table 13 reports the BRMSE for these parameter estimates across different bootstrap sample sizes $b = \{25, 50, 75, 100, 200\}$. Additionally, Table 12 contains the parameter estimates and BRMSE of the estimator defined in Example 3 in Section 4.

Table 11: Parameter estimates for α -trimmed mean and α -Winsorized mean, for $\alpha = 0.01, 0.02, 0.20$

| Variables | α -trimmed mean | | | α -Winsorized mean | | |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | $\alpha = 0.01$ | $\alpha = 0.02$ | $\alpha = 0.20$ | $\alpha = 0.01$ | $\alpha = 0.02$ | $\alpha = 0.20$ |
| age | 2.3004 | 1.9851 | -4.4195 | 2.6723 | 3.2969 | -0.0265 |
| educ | 15.1809 | 15.3170 | 12.3471 | 14.6552 | 14.3941 | 11.9117 |
| exper | 23.7517 | 23.5119 | 21.8545 | 24.7803 | 23.4696 | 21.4691 |
| expersq | -4.2199 | -4.2695 | -4.7762 | -4.3246 | -4.5611 | -4.2299 |
| kidslt6 | -7.7039 | -7.0448 | -8.3693 | -5.7924 | -7.7605 | -5.6729 |
| kidsge6 | -4.3523 | -4.0552 | -2.5310 | -5.4866 | -5.6679 | 0.4380 |
| nwifeinc | -1.3488 | -1.9850 | -5.3529 | -1.2859 | -1.4251 | -2.2519 |
| residual | -4.4149 | -4.1638 | -4.3432 | -4.5116 | -3.8497 | -5.2681 |

Table 12: Parameter estimates and BREMSE for the estimator defined in Example 3

| Variables | Estimator and BRMSE for Example 3 | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Estimates | $b = 25$ | $b = 50$ | $b = 75$ | $b = 100$ | $b = 200$ |
| age | -1.9084 | 4.1714 | 5.6643 | 5.6334 | 5.4617 | 5.3665 |
| educ | 19.8326 | 17.4322 | 19.4899 | 18.4279 | 18.4255 | 17.8923 |
| exper | 29.4500 | 27.9768 | 29.6823 | 29.6398 | 29.1016 | 28.7205 |
| expersq | -3.6951 | 9.3467 | 7.7024 | 7.4326 | 6.0869 | 6.0422 |
| kidslt6 | -9.6599 | 10.8408 | 10.6208 | 11.3201 | 11.2522 | 10.6196 |
| kidsge6 | -3.3560 | 8.9355 | 7.5635 | 7.0924 | 6.6037 | 5.4690 |
| nwifeinc | -4.1847 | 8.1198 | 7.6849 | 7.5052 | 7.4043 | 6.6104 |
| residual | -4.3298 | 8.1653 | 8.1534 | 8.5166 | 8.0292 | 7.9207 |

In Table 11, α -trimmed mean and α -Winsorized mean demonstrate a consistent trend: the positive age coefficient when $\alpha = 0.01, 0.02$, and it suggests that as married women age increases, they tend to increase their hours of work. However, for $\alpha = 0.20$, the conclusion is opposite, which makes sense as hours of work are supposed to be decreased as age increases for married women. It further indicates that the data set is likely to have some outliers (see Figure 5). Also, the estimator defined in Example 3 in Section 4 presents a negative age coefficient, which implies that as married women grow older, they tend to reduce their working hours. Despite these differences, all three estimators demonstrate a positive coefficient for education (education) and experience (experience), implying that married women with higher levels of education and experience tend to work longer hours. Also, the coefficient for the squared term of experience (expersq) is negative for all three estimators. This suggests that while greater experience initially leads to more working hours, this effect diminishes as experience increases. Furthermore, the presence of small children under 6 or children over 6 is associated with fewer working hours, as indicated by the negative coefficients for the variables (kidslt6) and (kidsge6). In the overall context, working hours are positively influenced by age, education, and experience in the case of α -trimmed mean and α -Winsorized mean. However, they are negatively impacted by the expersq, kidslt6 or kidsge6, nwifeinc, and whereas in the case of the estimator defined in Example 3, working hours are positively influenced by education and experience but negatively affected by the presence of “kidsge6”, “nwifeinc”, and other factors. The residual term also has a negative impact in this case.

The results from Tables 12 and 13 reveal a mixed scenario regarding the performance of parameter estimates, as indicated by BRMSE. When considering a small bootstrap sample size, BRMSE shows improvement for certain parameters like “educ,” but it increases for other variables such as “kidslt6” and “nwifeinc” across all α values. Overall, as expected, larger bootstrap sample sizes tend to yield more reliable estimates, with BRMSE decreasing as sample size increases, indicating better precision. The influence of α values on BRMSE is evident, with $\alpha = 0.20$ and $\alpha = 0.02$ generally resulting in lower BRMSE for larger bootstrap samples compared to $\alpha = 0.01$. The data suggests that increasing bootstrap replications generally enhances the performance of parameter estimates in terms of BRMSE. Moreover, the performance of estimators improves with higher trimming proportions, implying the presence of outliers

Table 13: BRMSE of parameter estimates for α -trimmed mean and α -Winsorized mean when $\alpha = 0.01, 0.02, 0.20$

| | BRMSE, α -trimmed mean | | | | | BRMSE, α -Winsorized mean | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | $\alpha = 0.01$ | | | | | | | | | |
| Variables | $b = 25$ | $b = 50$ | $b = 75$ | $b = 100$ | $b = 200$ | $b = 25$ | $b = 50$ | $b = 75$ | $b = 100$ | $b = 200$ |
| age | 6.9025 | 5.9225 | 4.5379 | 4.4733 | 4.4385 | 3.4793 | 3.6082 | 5.6003 | 5.0576 | 5.0017 |
| educ | 14.9525 | 14.5061 | 14.6298 | 14.1398 | 14.5784 | 14.7756 | 14.2998 | 14.0766 | 14.0379 | 14.0019 |
| exper | 23.1121 | 23.9217 | 23.0052 | 7.6685 | 7.1951 | 23.1546 | 23.0288 | 23.0853 | 23.0555 | 23.0422 |
| expersq | 7.0653 | 7.2846 | 7.1502 | 7.0685 | 7.0251 | 8.3199 | 8.0245 | 7.2879 | 7.2718 | 7.1265 |
| kidslt6 | 8.8129 | 8.9512 | 8.1709 | 8.1342 | 8.0552 | 7.9862 | 8.6181 | 9.2364 | 9.1216 | 8.7599 |
| kidsge6 | 7.5438 | 8.2794 | 7.6612 | 7.0774 | 7.0020 | 9.5989 | 8.5860 | 8.4013 | 8.3491 | 8.1709 |
| nwifeinc | 3.8540 | 8.0073 | 6.7732 | 6.9257 | 6.4667 | 4.8807 | 5.0512 | 5.4469 | 4.5340 | 4.4217 |
| residual | 7.4851 | 7.9285 | 6.6482 | 6.2391 | 6.1497 | 6.6852 | 8.5323 | 8.3165 | 6.9992 | 6.4343 |
| | $\alpha = 0.02$ | | | | | | | | | |
| age | 4.9219 | 4.1721 | 2.9882 | 4.1762 | 4.0887 | 4.5430 | 4.2311 | 7.2968 | 7.0489 | 5.9689 |
| educ | 15.6677 | 15.3316 | 15.1799 | 14.9809 | 14.8205 | 9.6751 | 6.7921 | 6.4150 | 5.4424 | 4.9195 |
| exper | 23.5777 | 24.3622 | 23.8121 | 23.3626 | 23.0762 | 7.7911 | 5.5320 | 6.0543 | 6.3188 | 4.4880 |
| expersq | 6.8877 | 6.4023 | 6.4418 | 6.3116 | 6.3047 | 10.0748 | 3.7419 | 6.0543 | 6.0088 | 4.4880 |
| kidslt6 | 8.9114 | 9.0661 | 8.7789 | 8.5657 | 8.0430 | 3.8884 | 5.9683 | 5.3010 | 5.2230 | 5.0822 |
| kidsge6 | 8.2963 | 6.0569 | 6.3264 | 6.0951 | 6.0325 | 12.4818 | 5.3319 | 5.1951 | 4.6089 | 4.5068 |
| nwifeinc | 4.5687 | 7.1909 | 5.1988 | 5.0937 | 5.0268 | 13.4388 | 6.0679 | 5.7135 | 5.4986 | 4.6289 |
| residual | 7.8353 | 8.4133 | 7.4161 | 7.1263 | 7.0406 | 10.0395 | 10.7615 | 10.1960 | 5.1033 | 4.2763 |
| | $\alpha = 0.20$ | | | | | | | | | |
| age | 6.7119 | 8.8537 | 7.8333 | 4.0662 | 4.0032 | 4.9207 | 6.4777 | 4.7017 | 4.5382 | 3.9375 |
| educ | 12.4243 | 12.9229 | 12.7528 | 12.0157 | 11.7030 | 11.0408 | 12.2314 | 11.4508 | 11.3584 | 11.2935 |
| exper | 21.5681 | 21.7707 | 21.2526 | 21.1134 | 19.9628 | 19.8669 | 20.6090 | 20.4094 | 20.3946 | 20.1240 |
| expersq | 8.4187 | 8.2567 | 7.3494 | 5.3215 | 5.9297 | 8.1333 | 6.3889 | 7.5108 | 7.4375 | 7.3153 |
| kidslt6 | 11.7281 | 11.7853 | 11.5799 | 8.0941 | 7.6841 | 9.2211 | 9.1069 | 8.2365 | 7.8665 | 6.8852 |
| kidsge6 | 8.3459 | 7.3279 | 6.1896 | 5.7441 | 4.7452 | 4.4740 | 3.8739 | 7.6806 | 5.3986 | 4.8871 |
| nwifeinc | 8.4402 | 8.5644 | 8.4793 | 8.4723 | 4.9742 | 4.7178 | 4.8311 | 6.3046 | 5.8445 | 5.4379 |
| residual | 10.0431 | 8.1517 | 6.5809 | 6.1770 | 5.4622 | 6.6833 | 8.6092 | 8.3502 | 6.8890 | 6.3961 |

or influential observations in the dataset.

6 Conclusions

In this article, we proposed the L-estimators of the unknown parameters involved in the instrumental variable regression in the presence of endogeneity and possibly for the dependent error random variables. The estimation procedure is based on two-stage procedures, and the asymptotic properties of the L-estimators of the unknown parameters have been thoroughly studied. The proposed estimator performs well for various simulated data and real data.

Recently, [16] proposed a goodness of fit statistic named GIVE statistic for the instrumental variables regression. However, they neither considered dependent errors nor they related instrumental variable regression with the concept of endogeneity. In the same spirit of their approach, one may propose a goodness-of-fit statistic for the model considered here. Besides, one may also carry out test like $H_0 : \beta = \beta_0$ against $H_1 : \beta \neq \beta_0$ using the L-estimator proposed here. Generally speaking, the applications of the proposed L-estimator may be of interest to future research.

As we mentioned earlier, we have done thorough simulation studies for finite samples of different sizes. However, it does not theoretically justify the performance of the proposed estimator when the limiting sample size is infinite. This work can be carried out using the assertion in Corollary 1, which is left as a future work.

Acknowledgement: Subhra Sankar Dhar gratefully acknowledges his core research grant CRG/2022/001489, Government of India.

7 Appendix

We begin by introducing definitions that have been used throughout the article.

7.1 Definition

Definition 7.1. Stochastically equicontinuous: (see [48]) Let $\{\mathcal{H}_n(\beta) : n \geq 1\}$ be a family of random functions defined from $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where \mathcal{B} is any normed metric space. Then $\{\mathcal{H}_n\}$ is stochastically equicontinuous on \mathcal{B} if $\forall \epsilon^* > 0, \exists \delta > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{\beta' \in \mathcal{B}(\beta, \delta)} |\mathcal{H}_n(\beta') - \mathcal{H}_n(\beta)| > \epsilon^* \right) < \epsilon^*. \quad (7.1)$$

Here $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \delta) = \{\beta' \in \mathcal{B} : \|\beta' - \beta\| \leq \delta\}$.

Definition 7.2. Identifiable Uniqueness: (see [52]) Suppose β_0 is a minimizer of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_n(\beta, \tau) = \mathcal{E}[\mathcal{S}_n(\beta, \tau)]$ on \mathcal{B} . Let $\mathcal{S}_0(\epsilon^*)$ be an open ball centered at β_0 with radius $\epsilon^* > 0$. Define the neighborhood $\eta_0(\epsilon) = \mathcal{S}_0(\epsilon^*) \subset \mathcal{B}$ with complement $\eta_0(\epsilon^*)^c := \mathcal{B} \setminus \eta_0(\epsilon^*)$. Then β_0 is said to be identifiable unique on \mathcal{B} if and only if for every $\epsilon^* > 0$, $\inf_{\beta_0 \in \eta_0(\epsilon^*)^c} [\overline{\mathcal{F}}_n(\beta, \tau) - \overline{\mathcal{F}}_n(\beta_0, \tau)] > 0$.

7.2 Uniform Consistency of $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$

The following preliminary lemmas are used in three steps to prove Theorem 3.1. First, we show that $\mathcal{S}_n(\beta, \tau) - \overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\beta, \tau)$ converges almost surely to 0 uniformly in β and τ . In second step, for each τ , $\beta_0(\tau)$ is the identifiably unique minimizer of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\beta, \tau)$ whenever β near $\beta_0(\tau)$. Lemma 7.3, which is similar to Lemma B.1 of [11], yields the strong uniform consistency of $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$ for $\beta_0(\tau)$ in the last step. This Lemma is an extension of the consistency of M-estimators to estimated processes.

Lemma 7.1. (*Lemma 3.18 of [22]*) *Let $\{y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables such that $\psi(n) = O(n)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}$, $r > 2$, which takes value in (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , \mathcal{F} is a σ -field. Let $\rho_\tau: \Omega \times \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^m \times (0, 1)$ is compact. Assume that $\rho_\tau(y_i, \beta)$ is almost surely Lipchitz- L_1 (see p. 21 in [22] for the definition) on $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and either*

1. (a) *For some $\eta^* > 0$, $\rho_\tau(y_i, \beta)$ is $\frac{r}{2} + \eta^*$ dominated (see p. 33 in [22] for the definition) on $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$ uniformly in i .*
 (b) *There exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_\tau(y_i, \beta)$ is measurable for all $(\beta, \tau) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, or*
2. (a) *$\rho_\tau(y_i, \beta)$ is r -dominated on $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$ uniformly in i , and*
 (b) *$\{\rho_\tau(\beta, \tau)\}$ is near-epoch dependent on $\{y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of size- $\frac{1}{2}$ (see p. 27 in [22] for the definition of near-epoch dependent with size) on $(\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}, \rho)$, where ρ is any convenient norm on \mathbb{R}^m . Then*
 - *$\mathcal{E}[\rho_\tau(y_i, \beta)]$ is continuous on $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$, uniformly in i .*
 - *$\sup_{(\tau, \beta) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}} \|\mathcal{E}_n[\rho_\tau(y, \beta)] - \overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\beta, \tau)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, where $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\beta, \tau) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}[\rho_\tau(y_i, \beta)]$ and $\rho_\tau(y_i, \beta) = \rho_\tau(y_i - \max\{0, \mathbf{x}^T \beta\})$.*

Lemma 7.2. *Under assumptions (A.1)-(A.3), $\beta_0(\tau)$ uniquely minimize $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\beta, \tau)$ uniformly over \mathcal{T} .*

Proof. To show $\beta_0(\tau)$ is the unique minimum of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\beta, \tau)$, following the similar technique as in [39] and [44], it is enough to show that for any $\epsilon^* > 0$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \inf_{\|\beta - \beta_0(\tau)\| > \epsilon^*} \{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\beta, \tau) - \overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\beta_0(\tau), \tau)\} > 0.$$

Observe that for each τ , $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau)$ is not convex in β . Therefore, to demonstrate that $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau) - \mathcal{Q}_n(\beta_0(\tau), \tau)$ has identifiably unique minima whenever β near $\beta_0(\tau)$, the conditional expectation of $\mathcal{S}_n(\beta, \tau)$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[\mathcal{S}_n(\beta, \tau) | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i] &= \mathcal{E}[\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau) | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i] - \mathcal{E}[\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta_0(\tau), \tau) | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i]. \\ &= \mathcal{E}_n \left[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \beta > 0) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \beta_0(\tau) > 0) E_{\epsilon_i | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i} \{ \rho_\tau(y - \mathbf{x}^T \beta) - \rho_\tau(y - \mathbf{x}^T \beta_0(\tau)) \} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{E}_n \left[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \beta > 0) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \beta_0(\tau) < 0) E_{\epsilon_i | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i} \{ \rho_\tau(y - \mathbf{x}^T \beta) - \rho_\tau(y) \} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{E}_n \left[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \beta < 0) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \beta_0(\tau) > 0) E_{\epsilon_i | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i} \{ \rho_\tau(y) - \rho_\tau(y - \mathbf{x}^T \beta_0(\tau)) \} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Here $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i = \sigma(\dots, \mathbf{x}_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, is sigma algebra generated by sequence of random variable $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}'$ s until i . Since all terms of the above expressions are positive, so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{S}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i] &\geq \mathcal{E}_n[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} > 0) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0) \int_0^{\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*} (\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^* - t) f_\varepsilon(t - \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) dt] \\ &+ \mathcal{E}_n[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} < 0) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0) \int_{-\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)}^0 (\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) + t) f_\varepsilon(t - \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) dt], \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}^* = \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)$. Following the same argument as in (A.10) of [39], we see that Assumption (A.2) combined with the inequality presented in (7.3) leads to the following conclusions:

$$\mathcal{E} [\mathcal{S}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i] \geq \frac{\varrho_1 c^2}{2} \mathcal{E}_n [\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0) \mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*| \geq c)], \quad (7.4)$$

for any positive $c < \min(\epsilon_0, \varrho_1)$, where ϵ_0 is defined in (A.3). Now, taking expectation with respect to random vector $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^i$ defined in (2.5), and for any $\epsilon_0 > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) = \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{S}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)] &\geq \frac{\varrho_1 c^2}{2} \mathcal{E}_n [\mathcal{E}_x \{ \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*| \geq c) \}], \\ &\geq \frac{\varrho_1 c^2}{2} \mathcal{E}_n [\mathcal{E}_x \{ \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*| \geq c) \}^3 \{ \mathcal{E}_x \|\mathbf{x}\|^3 / K_0^3 \}^2] \\ &\quad \text{(From Assumption A.3)} \\ &\geq \frac{\varrho_1 c^2 K_0^{-6}}{2} \mathcal{E}_n [\mathcal{E}_x \{ \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*| \geq c) \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 \}^3] \\ &\quad \text{(Using Hölder's inequality and Jensen's inequality)} \\ &\geq \frac{\varrho_1 c^2 K_0^{-6}}{2} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_n \left[\mathcal{E}_x \left\{ \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > \epsilon_0) \mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*| \geq c) (\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*)^2 \|\boldsymbol{\delta}^*\|^{-2} \right\} \right] \right\}^3 \\ &\quad \text{(Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality)} \\ &\geq \frac{\varrho_1 c^2 K_0^{-6}}{2} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_n \left[\mathcal{E}_x \left\{ \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > \epsilon_0) \{1 - \mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*| < c)\} (\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^*)^2 \|\boldsymbol{\delta}^*\|^{-2} \right\} \right] \right\}^3 \\ &\geq \frac{\varrho_1 c^2 K_0^{-6}}{2} \{ (\lambda_n \|\boldsymbol{\delta}^*\|^2 - c^2) \|\boldsymbol{\delta}^*\|^{-2} \}^3. \end{aligned}$$

Here λ_n is the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix Q_n defined in A.3 and it is strictly positive for large n . Thus, choosing c such that $\lambda_0 \|\boldsymbol{\delta}^*\|^2 > c^2$, which implies that $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)$ is strict positive, uniformly in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and τ , for $\|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\| > \epsilon^*$ and for large n . \square

Lemma 7.3. (Lemma B.1 of [11]) Let $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) \in (\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T})$, where $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^m \times (0, 1)$ is compact set.

1. Define $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)$ such that $\mathcal{S}_n((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau), \tau) | \tau) \leq \inf_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}} [\mathcal{S}_n((\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) | \tau)] + \epsilon_n$, $\epsilon_n \searrow 0$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) = O_p(1)$.
2. $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}} [\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n((\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) | \tau)]$ is identifiably unique defined continuous process in $l^\infty(\mathcal{T})$.
3. $\sup_{(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}} \|\mathcal{S}_n((\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) | \tau) - \overline{\mathcal{S}}_n((\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) | \tau)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, where $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n((\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) | \tau)$ is continuous. Then
 - $\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1: The normalized objective functions are as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) = \mathcal{Q}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) - \mathcal{Q}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau), \tau), \quad (7.5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) = \mathcal{E}_n[\rho_\tau(y - \max\{0, \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}\})] \quad (7.6)$$

and $\rho_\tau(u) = (\tau - \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq 0\}})u$. First, note that minimizing $\mathcal{Q}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)$ is equivalent to minimizing the normalized function. Let

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^* = y_i - \max\{0, \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\}, \quad (7.7)$$

and define

$$h_i = h_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \tau) = \max\{0, \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}\} - \max\{0, \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\}, \quad (7.8)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}^* = \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)$. Note that for each i , $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) \rightarrow \rho_\tau(y_i - \max(0, \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}))$ is continuous function of $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$ given (y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) and measurable function of (y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) for a given $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$. Therefore conditions (a) and (b) of Lemma 7.1 holds. To verify Assumption (c), observe that

$$\mathcal{S}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) = \mathcal{E}_n[\rho_\tau(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^* - h)] - \mathcal{E}_n[\rho_\tau(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^*)] \quad (7.9)$$

Observe that Knight's identity (see [30]) gives us

$$\rho_\tau(a - b) - \rho_\tau(a) = b\psi_\tau(a) + \int_0^b \{\mathbb{1}_{\{a < s\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{a < 0\}}\} ds$$

and

$$|\rho_\tau(a - b) - \rho_\tau(a)| \leq 3|b|,$$

where $\psi_\tau(u) = \tau - \mathbb{1}_{u \leq 0}$. Using Knight's identity, one can write

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{S}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)| &\leq \mathcal{E}_n |\rho_\tau(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^* - h) - \rho_\tau(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^*)| \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_n |h| \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |h_i| &= |h_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \tau)| = |\max\{0, \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}\} - \max\{0, \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\}| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{x}_i\| (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\| + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\|). \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

Since $|h_i|$ is $\mathcal{O}\|\mathbf{x}_i\|$ in view of the fact that $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$ is a compact set, and further, it follows from (A.2) and (A.3) that $E[|h_i|] < \infty$. Hence, Lemma 7.1 obtains following:

$$\sup_{(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}} \|\mathcal{S}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) - \overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) = E[\mathcal{S}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)]$ is continuous. Lemma 7.2 establishes that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)$ is unique minimum of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Therefore, conditions (1),(2), and (3) of Lemma 7.3 holds. Afterwards, by invoking the Lemma 7.3 again, it follows that $\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)$ being continuous in τ , by Assumption A.5. \square

7.3 Strong Consistency of \mathcal{L}_n

Proof of Theorem 3.2: For the model defined in (2.5), the smooth L-estimator can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \int_0^1 \hat{\beta}_n(\tau) J(\tau) d\tau, \quad (7.12)$$

and $\mathcal{L}_0 = \int_0^1 \beta_0(\tau) J(\tau) d\tau$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_n - L_0\| &= \left\| \int_0^1 (\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau)) J(\tau) d\tau \right\| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \|(\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau))\| |J(\tau)| d\tau \\ &= \lim_{\tau_0 \rightarrow 0} \int_{\tau_0}^{1-\tau_0} \|(\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau))\| |J(\tau)| d\tau \\ &\leq \lim_{\tau_0 \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\tau \in [\tau_0, 1-\tau_0]} \|\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau)\| m_0 \quad (\text{Using the Assumption A.4}) \\ &\xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \end{aligned} \quad (B.1)$$

where the equation (B.1) follows from the uniform consistency of $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T} \subseteq (0, 1)$ and $m_0 > 0$ such that $|J(\tau)| \leq m_0$, for all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Hence, it follows that $\|\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. \square

Remark 7.1. *The proof of Theorem 3.1 follows the approach outlined in [20], [19], and [39]. While we have established consistency for the case of dependent errors, the consistency for the case of i.i.d. errors can also be demonstrated. This can be achieved by using Lemma 2.3 from [52] in place of Lemma 7.1 with some necessary modifications. Furthermore, we have derived asymptotic normality under the assumption of i.i.d. errors by assuming in Assumption A.2 that the errors are i.i.d. and that ε_i and \mathbf{x}_i is independent. The consistency result for i.i.d. errors was utilized to establish the asymptotic normality result.*

7.4 Asymptotic Normality of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau))$

Since $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau)$ is neither convex nor differentiable with respect to β , we use Lemma A3 in [38] to exchange asymptotically the sub-gradient of the non-smooth distance function, $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau)$, by the gradient of the smooth limit function, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_n(\beta, \tau)$. To prove the asymptotic Normality of the censored quantile regression process $\{\hat{\beta}_n(\tau), \tau \in \mathcal{T} \subset (0, 1)\}$, the adopted methods are similar to the methods considered in [2], [9], and [11].

Proof of Theorem 3.3: Define the following process:

$$\sqrt{n}\mathcal{E}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta, \tau)] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(\varepsilon_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \beta, \tau), \quad (7.13)$$

where

$$\psi(\varepsilon_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \beta, \tau) = \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta > 0) \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \delta^* - \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) (-\mathbf{x}_i) : \beta \in \mathcal{B}, \tau \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (7.14)$$

for $\delta^* = \beta - \beta_0(\tau)$. The class of function $\psi(\cdot)$ can be written as (See, [39])

$$\{\psi(\varepsilon_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \beta, \tau) = \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta > 0) \varphi_\tau(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta) (-\mathbf{x}_i) : \beta \in \mathcal{B}, \tau \in \mathcal{T}\},$$

where $\varphi_\tau(u) = \tau - \mathbf{1}_{\{u \leq 0\}}$. Moreover, observe that $n^{-1/2}(\sqrt{n}\mathcal{E}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta, \tau)])$ is the vector of left partial derivatives of the objective function $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau)$ defined in (7.6) above. Now, the proof of this theorem follows from the following five steps.

First step: Since $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$ minimizes the objective function $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau)$ uniformly over \mathcal{T} defined in (7.6), the directional derivative of $\mathcal{Q}_n(\beta, \tau)$ at $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$ towards an arbitrary direction is non-negative. Now, consider the j^{th} component of $\sqrt{n}\mathcal{E}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta, \tau)]$, and let $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^m . Afterward, it is possible to choose $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that by using the monotonicity of the one-sided gradient, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sqrt{n}\mathcal{E}_{n,j} \left[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \hat{\beta}_n(\tau), \tau) \right] \right| &\leq \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \left[\Psi_{n,j}(\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) + ae_j) - \Psi_{n,j}(\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - ae_j) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n |x_{i,j}| \left[\mathbf{1}(y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}_n(\tau)) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}_n(\tau) = 0) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\max_{i \leq n} \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(0 < y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}_n(\tau)) + \frac{3}{2} \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}_n(\tau) = 0). \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

Further, $\max_{i \leq n} \|\mathbf{x}_i\| = O(\sqrt{n})$ almost surely by A.3, and the sum involved in (7.15) is finite with probability one as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in view of A.2, A.6 and the strong uniform consistency of $\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)$. Hence, uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, we have

$$\sqrt{n}\mathcal{E}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta, \tau)]|_{\beta=\hat{\beta}_n(\tau)} = o_p(1). \quad (7.16)$$

Second step: Define the empirical process

$$\mathbb{G}_n\{\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta, \tau)\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\psi(\varepsilon_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \beta, \tau) - \mathcal{E}[\psi(\varepsilon_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \beta, \tau)]\}$$

when $(\beta, \tau) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$, which is a compact set, and $\psi(\cdot)$ is same as defined in (7.14). Here, we show that $(\beta, \tau) \mapsto \mathbb{G}_n\{\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta, \tau)\}$ is stochastically equicontinuous on $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$, with respect to the pseudometric ρ endowed in corresponding L_2 space, which is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho[(\beta_1, \tau_1), (\beta_2, \tau_2)]^2 &= \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_1 > 0) \varphi_{\tau_1}(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T (\beta - \beta_0(\tau_1)) - \mathcal{Q}(\tau_1)) (-\mathbf{x}_{i,j}) \\ &\quad - \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_2 > 0) \varphi_{\tau_2}(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T (\beta_2 - \beta_0(\tau_2)) - \mathcal{Q}(\tau_2)) (-\mathbf{x}_{i,j})]^2, \end{aligned} \quad (7.17)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}$ is the j -th ($j = 1, \dots, m$) component of i -th ($i = 1, \dots, n$) observations of random vector \mathbf{x} . Now, we show that the class of function

$$\mathcal{H} = \{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta > 0) \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \delta^* - \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) (-\mathbf{x}_{i,j}) : \beta \in \mathcal{B}, \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$$

is Donsker class on the compact set $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{T}$. This class is formed as $\mathcal{F}_0(\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{F})(-\mathbf{x}_{i,j})$, where $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{1}(\varepsilon_i \leq \mathbf{x}_i^T \delta^* + \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) : \beta \in \mathcal{B}, \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$, $\mathcal{T} = \{\tau : \tau \in \mathcal{T}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta > 0) : \beta \in \mathcal{B}\}$. By Lemma 2.6.15

and Lemma 2.6.18 in [48], the class of function \mathcal{F}_0 and \mathcal{F} is a VC subgraph class (see [50]). Hence, \mathcal{H} is a Donsker class with a constant envelope. Now, using Theorem 2.10.6 in [47] repeatedly, we have the following results. First, $(\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{F})$ is a Donsker class with a constant envelope. Next, the product of $\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{F}$ and $(-\mathbf{x}_{i,j})$ is Donsker class with square integrable envelope $2 \cdot \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |\mathbf{x}_{i,j}|$. Finally, in view of the previous two facts, we have $\mathcal{F}_0(\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{F})(-\mathbf{x}_{i,j})$ is Donsker class. Thus, \mathbb{G}_n is ρ -stochastically equicontinuous in the corresponding L_2 space as defined in (7.17) since Donsker class of function is stochastically equicontinuous (see, e.g., [47]).

Third step: Now, we try to show that

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\mathbb{G}_n[\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau), \tau)] - \mathbb{G}_n[\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau), \tau)]\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \quad (7.18)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\psi(\cdot)$ is defined in (7.14).

To prove it, we show that strong uniform consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)$ implies that

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \rho[(\tau, b(\tau)), (\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau))]^2 \Big|_{b(\tau) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \quad (7.19)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where ρ is pseudometric on \mathcal{H} defined in (7.17). Let us consider

$$\begin{aligned} \rho[(\tau, b(\tau)), (\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau))]^2 &= \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathcal{E}[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T b(\tau) > 0) \varphi_\tau(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T (b(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) (-\mathbf{x}_{i,j}) \\ &\quad - \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0) \varphi_\tau(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) (-\mathbf{x}_{i,j})]^2 \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \mathcal{E}[\tau \cdot |\mathbf{x}_{i,j}| \cdot \mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}_i^T b(\tau)| \leq |\mathbf{x}_i^T (b(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau))|) \\ &\quad + |\mathbf{x}_{i,j}| \cdot \mathbf{1}(|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T b(\tau)| \leq |\mathbf{x}_i^T (b(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau))|)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next, using A.2, A.3, and A.6 along with the application of A.M.-G.M. inequality, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho[(\tau, b(\tau)), (\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau))]^2 &\leq 2\tau^2 \mathcal{E}[\mathbf{1}(|\mathbf{x}_i^T b(\tau)| \leq \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \|b(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\|) \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{E}[\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \cdot \mathbf{1}(|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T b(\tau)| \leq \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \|b(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\|)] \\ &\leq \|b(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\| (2\tau^2 \cdot K_1 + 2 \cdot \varrho_2 \mathcal{E}_x[\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^3]) \\ &\leq \|b(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\| (2\tau^2 \cdot K_1 + 2 \cdot \varrho_2 \cdot K_0^3). \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

Hence,

$$\rho[(\tau, b(\tau)), (\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau))]^2 \Big|_{b(\tau) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} \leq (2\tau^2 \cdot K_1 + 2 \cdot \varrho_2 \cdot K_0^3) \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\|. \quad (7.21)$$

Therefore, in view of the uniform consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)$ on (7.21), we have that (7.19) holds. Furthermore, considering the stochastic equicontinuity of the $(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau) \mapsto \mathbb{G}_n[\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)]$, along with that fact $\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ and (7.19), it follows that (7.18) holds.

Next, we try to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}[\mathcal{E}_n\{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} &\approx \mathcal{E}_x \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\varepsilon(\mathcal{Q}(\tau)) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \right] (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) \\ &\approx \mathbb{D}_n(\tau) \cdot (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)), \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

where matrix $\mathbb{D}_n(\tau) = [f_\varepsilon(\mathcal{Q}(\tau))\mathbb{M}_n(\tau)]$ and $\mathbb{M}_n(\tau)$ defined as follows:

$$\mathbb{M}_n(\tau) = \mathcal{E}_x \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \right]. \quad (7.23)$$

First, let us consider

$$\mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}] = \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} > 0) \varphi_\tau(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\delta}^* - \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) (-\mathbf{x}_i)\}]. \quad (7.24)$$

Using Taylor series expansion, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}]_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} &\approx \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}]_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}=\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)} + \frac{d}{d\boldsymbol{\beta}} \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}]_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}=\boldsymbol{\beta}^*(\tau)} \\ &\quad \cdot (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)), \end{aligned} \quad (7.25)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*(\tau)$ is some point on the straight line connecting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)$. Next, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\boldsymbol{\beta}} \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}]_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} &= \frac{d}{d\boldsymbol{\beta}} \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} > 0) \varphi_\tau(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{x}^T (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) - \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) (-\mathbf{x})\}] \\ &= \frac{d}{d\boldsymbol{\beta}} \mathcal{E}_n [\mathcal{E}_x \{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} > 0) (F_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}^T (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) + \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) - \tau) (\mathbf{x})\}] \\ &= \mathcal{E}_n [\mathcal{E}_x \{f_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}^T (\boldsymbol{\beta}^*(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) + \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*(\tau) > 0) \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^T\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (7.26)$$

In this instance, $\mathcal{Q}(\tau)$ is the same as defined in (2.7). As $E[\mathcal{Q}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)]$ is differentiable with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and the true parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)$ minimizes $E[\mathcal{Q}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)]$, we have

$$\mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau), \tau)\}] = 0.$$

Further, combining (7.25) and (7.26), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}]_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} &\approx \mathcal{E}_n [\mathcal{E}_x \{f_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}^T (\boldsymbol{\beta}^*(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) + \mathcal{Q}(\tau)) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*(\tau) > 0) \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^T\}] \\ &\quad \cdot (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)). \end{aligned} \quad (7.27)$$

Finally, (7.22) follows from (7.27) in view of the fact that the probability density function of the error random variable is a uniformly continuous and uniformly bounded function. Hence, the following Taylor expansion is valid uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$.

Fourth step: Recall (7.16), and we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n} \mathcal{E}_n [\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)]_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} - \sqrt{n} \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}]_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} + \sqrt{n} \mathcal{E} [\mathcal{E}_n \{\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \tau)\}]_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau)} \\ &= \mathbb{G}_n \left[\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau), \tau) \right] + \mathbb{D}_n(\tau) \cdot \sqrt{n} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) \\ &= \mathbb{G}_n [\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau), \tau)] + o_p(1) + \mathbb{D}_n(\tau) \cdot \sqrt{n} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) = o_p(1), \end{aligned} \quad (7.28)$$

which leads to

$$\mathbb{D}_n(\tau) \cdot \sqrt{n} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(\tau) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau)) = -\mathbb{G}_n [\psi(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau), \tau)] + o_p(1). \quad (7.29)$$

As $\|Ab\| \geq \lambda_{(1)}\|b\|$ (see, e.g., [2]), where A is a symmetric positive definite matrix, b is such that $\|b\| \neq 0$, and $\lambda_{(1)}$ is the smallest eigen value of A along with in view of A.3, we have

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\mathbb{G}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta_0(\tau), \tau)] + o_p(1)\| \geq \lambda_{(n,1)} \cdot \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau))\|, \quad (7.30)$$

where $\lambda_{(n,1)}$ is the smallest eigen value of $\mathbb{D}_n(\tau)$ uniformly in $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$.

Fifth step: Observe that $\tau \mapsto \beta_0(\tau)$ is continuously differentiable by the implicit function theorem (see, e.g., [2]) and in view of A.5. Moreover, $\beta_0(\tau)$ is one of the solutions of β in

$$\mathcal{E}_n[\mathcal{E}\{\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta > 0) \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \delta^* - Q_\varepsilon(\tau))(-\mathbf{x}_i)\}] = 0.$$

Furthermore, it holds that

$$\frac{d\beta_0(\tau)}{d\tau} = \mathbb{D}_n^{-1}(\tau) \mathcal{E}_n[\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_0(\tau) > 0) \mathbf{x}_i].$$

Hence, due to all the aforesaid facts, the process $\tau \mapsto \mathbb{G}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta_0(\tau), \tau)]$ is stochastically equicontinuous over \mathcal{T} with respect to the pseudometric given by $\rho[(\tau_1, \beta_0(\tau_1)), (\tau_2, \beta_0(\tau_2))]^2$, where ρ is defined in (7.17). Afterward, by stochastic equicontinuity and Lindeberg-Feller central limit theorem (See, [39]), we have

$$\mathbb{G}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta_0(\tau), \tau)] \Rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\cdot) \quad \text{in } l^\infty(\mathcal{T}), \quad (7.31)$$

where $\mathcal{G}(\cdot)$ is a centered Gaussian process with covariance function

$$\mathcal{E}[\mathcal{G}(\tau)\mathcal{G}(\tau_1)^T] = H(\tau, \tau_1) = [\min(\tau, \tau_1) - \tau\tau_1] \cdot \mathbb{M}(\tau),$$

and for $\tau < \tau_1$, $\mathbb{M}(\tau)$ defined in (3.3) is positive definite matrix by A.3.. Therefore,

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\mathbb{G}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta_0(\tau), \tau)] + o_p(1)\| = O_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

and which implies from (7.30) that

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \|\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau))\| = O_p(1) \quad (7.32)$$

Finally, using (7.30) and (7.32), we have

$$\mathbb{D}_n(\tau) \cdot \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n(\tau) - \beta_0(\tau)) = -\mathbb{G}_n[\psi(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}, \beta_0(\tau), \tau)] + o_p(1) \Rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\cdot), \quad \text{in } l^\infty(\mathcal{T}). \quad (7.33)$$

Hence, this theorem is proved. □

7.5 Asymptotic Normality of \mathcal{L}_n

Proof of Theorem 3.4: Theorem 3.3 asserts that

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}_{n,i} + o_p(1),$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{n,i}$ is a \mathbb{R}^m valued random vector. Explicit expressions : $\mathbf{v}_{n,i} = \mathbf{A}_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_i$, where

$$\mathbf{A}_{n,i} = \int_0^1 [\mathbb{D}_n^{-1}(\tau)\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(\tau) > 0)\{\tau - \mathbf{1}(\varepsilon_i \leq Q_\varepsilon(\tau))\}] J(\tau) d\tau.$$

Now, in view of Lindeberg-Feller multivariate CLT for the triangular array of independent random vectors $\{\mathbf{v}_{i,n} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ along with the conditions A.1 – A.6, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0) \Rightarrow Z,$$

where Z is a \mathbb{R}^m valued random vector associated with a m -dimensional multivariate normal distribution, with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix Σ defined in (3.4). \square

7.6 Consistent Estimation of Σ

Proof of Theorem 3.5: Recall that $\mathbb{D}_n(\cdot)$ (see (7.22)) is estimated in [2] for i.i.d. observations using the technique described in [39]. In order to do the same exercise for the model described in (2.8), let us consider

$$\hat{\mathbb{D}}_n(t) = \frac{n^{-1}}{2h_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t) > 0) \mathbf{1}(|r_i| \leq h_n) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \right], \quad (7.34)$$

where $r_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $h_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $nh_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Observe that $2.h_n \hat{\mathbb{D}}_n(t) = \mathcal{E}_n[\Psi_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t), h_n)]$, where $\Psi_i(\theta, b) = \mathbf{1}(|y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \theta| \leq b) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \theta > 0) \cdot \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T$. For any compact set \mathbb{B} and a positive constant \mathbb{H} , consider the following functional class: $\{\psi_i(\theta, b) : \theta \in \mathbb{B}, b \in (0, \mathbb{H}]\}$, which is a Donsker class with a square-integrable envelope by Theorem 2.10.6 in [48], because this is a product of the following two classes: $\{\mathbf{1}(|y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \theta| \leq b); \theta \in \mathbb{B}, b \in (0, \mathbb{H}]\}$, which is a VC class, and $\{\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \theta > 0); \theta \in \mathbb{B}\}$, which is also a VC class, and consequently, the product of these two classes is also a VC class having a square-integrable matrix $\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T$ envelope (By assumption A.3, $E\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^4 < \infty$). Therefore, the stochastic process $\{\mathcal{G}_n[\Psi_i(\theta, b)]; \theta \in \mathbb{B}, b \in (0, \mathbb{H}]\}$ converges to the Gaussian process in $l^\infty(\mathbb{B} \times (0, \mathbb{H}])$. This fact implies that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{B}, h \in (0, \mathbb{H}]} \sqrt{n} \|\mathcal{E}_n[\Psi_i(\theta, b)] - \mathcal{E}[\Psi_i(\theta, b)]\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

As \mathbb{B} is compact set, there exists a collection of countable sets $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0(t)$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathbb{B} \subset \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0(t)$, which further implies that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sqrt{n} \|\mathcal{E}_n[\Psi_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t), h_n)] - \mathcal{E}[\Psi_i(\theta, h_n)]_{|\theta = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t)}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0. \quad (7.35)$$

Now, observe that $\hat{\mathbb{D}}_n(t) = \frac{1}{2.h_n} \mathcal{E}_n[\Psi_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t), h_n)]$ and $\mathbb{D}_n(t) = \frac{1}{2.h_n} \mathcal{E}[\Psi_i(\theta, h_n)]_{|\theta = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t)} + o_p(1)$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbb{D}}_n(t) - \mathbb{D}_n(t) &= \frac{1}{2.h_n \sqrt{n}} \left[\sqrt{n} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_n[\Psi_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t), h_n)] - \mathcal{E}[\Psi_i(\theta, h_n)]_{|\theta = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n(t)} \right\} \right] + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2.h_n \sqrt{n}} (A_n) + o_p(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{0}_{m \times m} \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $t \in \mathcal{T}$ as $A_n \rightarrow 0$ almost surely, uniformly in $t \in \mathcal{T}$ (using (7.35)), and $nh_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence,

$$\hat{\mathbb{D}}_n(t) - \mathbb{D}_n(t) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{0} \quad (7.36)$$

uniformly in $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Now, $\mathbb{H}_n(t, s)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathbb{H}_n(t, s) = (t - ts)\mathbb{M}_n(t), 0 < t < s < 1, \quad (7.37)$$

where $\mathbb{M}_n(t)$ is the same as defined in (7.23). Observe that

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_n(t, s) = \mathcal{E}_n \left[g_i(\hat{\beta}_n(\cdot), t, s) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \right],$$

where $g_i(\theta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (\alpha_1 - \alpha_1 \alpha_2) \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \theta > 0)$, $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. Next, using Theorem 2.10.6 in [48], one can establish that the class

$$\{g_i(\theta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) : \theta \in \mathbb{B}, 0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < 1\}$$

is Donsker, and hence, it belongs to the Glivenko-Cantelli class for any compact set \mathbb{B} . This fact implies that for $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$

$$\mathcal{E}_n[g_i(\theta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T] - \mathcal{E}[g_i(\theta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad (7.38)$$

uniformly in $\theta \in \mathbb{B}, 0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < 1$. Hence, using (7.38) and in view of continuity of $\mathcal{E}[g_i(\theta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T]$ in $\theta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$, we have

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_n(t, s) - \mathbb{H}_n(t, s) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{0}_{m \times m}, \quad (7.39)$$

uniformly in $(t, s) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}$. Finally, using (7.36) and (7.39) and in view of continuous mapping theorem, we have

$$\hat{\Sigma}_n - \Sigma_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{0}_{m \times m} \quad (7.40)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$\Sigma_n = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 [\mathbb{D}_n(t)]^{-1} [\mathbb{H}_n(t, s)] [\mathbb{D}_n(s)]^{-1} J(t) J(s) dt ds. \quad (7.41)$$

Recall (3.4) that

$$\Sigma = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \mathbb{D}^{-1}(t) \mathbb{H}(t, s) \mathbb{D}^{-1}(s) J(t) J(s) dt ds,$$

and observe that

$$\Sigma_n = \mathcal{E}_{(S, T)} [[\mathbb{D}_n(T)]^{-1} [\mathbb{H}_n(T, S)] [\mathbb{D}_n(S)]^{-1} J(T) J(S)], \quad (7.42)$$

where (S, T) follows uniform distribution over $(0, 1) \times (0, 1)$. As $\mathbb{D}_n(\cdot)$ and $\mathbb{H}_n(\cdot, \cdot)$ are uniformly bounded, and in view of $\|\mathbb{D}_n(\cdot) - \mathbb{D}(\cdot)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\|\mathbb{H}_n(\cdot, \cdot) - \mathbb{H}(\cdot, \cdot)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with direct application of dominated convergence theorem on (7.42), we have

$$\Sigma_n - \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{0}_{m \times m}, \quad (7.43)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, the result follows from (7.40) and (7.43). \square

Proof of Corollary 1: Observe that $\sqrt{n}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0) = \sqrt{n}\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-\frac{1}{2}})(\mathcal{L}_n - \mathcal{L}_0)$. As $(\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\Sigma}_n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ converges to $(m \times m)$ -dimensional identity matrix as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which follows from the assertion in Theorem 3.5 and in view of the assertion in Theorem 3.4, the result follows. \square

References

- [1] Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson. The colonial origins of comparative development: An empirical investigation: Reply. *The American Economic Review*, 102(6):3077–3110, 2012. ISSN 00028282.
- [2] Joshua Angrist, Victor Chernozhukov, and Iván Fernández-Val. Quantile Regression under Misspecification, with an Application to the U.S. Wage Structure. *Econometrica*, 74(2):539–563, March 2006.
- [3] Jad Beyhum, Lorenzo Tedesco, and Ingrid Van Keilegom. Instrumental variable quantile regression under random right censoring. *Econom. J.*, 27(1):21–36, 2024. ISSN 1368-4221,1368-423X. doi: 10.1093/ectj/utad015. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/ectj/utad015>.
- [4] Peter J. Bickel. On some robust estimates of location. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(3): 847–858, 1965. ISSN 00034851.
- [5] Richard Blundell and James L. Powell. Censored regression quantiles with endogenous regressors. *Journal of Econometrics*, 141(1):65–83, 2007. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2007.01.016>. Semiparametric methods in econometrics.
- [6] D. A. (Darrell A.) Bowden Roger J. (Roger John) Turkington. *Instrumental variables / Roger J. Bowden and Darrell A. Turkington*. Cambridge University Press, 1984. ISBN 0521385822.
- [7] Taisuke Camponovo, Lorenzo; Otsu. Robustness of bootstrap in instrumental variable regression. *Econometric Reviews*, 32:352–393., 03 2015.
- [8] Probal Chaudhuri. Nonparametric estimates of regression quantiles and their local Bahadur representation. *Ann. Statist.*, 19(2):760–777, 1991. ISSN 0090-5364,2168-8966. doi: 10.1214/aos/1176348119. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176348119>.
- [9] Songnian Chen. Sequential estimation of censored quantile regression models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 207(1):30–52, 2018. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2018.06.020>.
- [10] Songnian Chen and Qian Wang. Semiparametric estimation of a censored regression model with endogeneity. *J. Econometrics*, 215(1):239–256, 2020. ISSN 0304-4076,1872-6895. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2019.08.006. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2019.08.006>.
- [11] Victor Chernozhukov and Christian Hansen. Instrumental quantile regression inference for structural and treatment effect models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 132:491–525, 06 2006. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2005.02.009.

- [12] Victor Chernozhukov and Han Hong. Three-step censored quantile regression and extramarital affairs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(459):872–882, 2002. ISSN 01621459.
- [13] Victor Chernozhukov, Iván Fernández-Val, and Amanda E. Kowalski. Quantile regression with censoring and endogeneity. *Journal of Econometrics*, 186(1):201–221, 2015. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2014.06.017>.
- [14] Holger Dette and Stanislav Volgushev. Non-crossing non-parametric estimates of quantile curves. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 70(3):609–627, 2008. ISSN 1369-7412,1467-9868. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00651.x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00651.x>.
- [15] Holger Dette, Jens Wagener, and Stanislav Volgushev. Comparing conditional quantile curves. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 38(1):63–88, 2011. ISSN 0303-6898,1467-9469. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9469.2010.00718.x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9469.2010.00718.x>.
- [16] Subhra Sankar Dhar and Shalabh. GIVE statistic for goodness of fit in instrumental variables models with application to COVID data. *Nature Scientific Reports*, page 9472, 2022. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-13240-y>. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-13240-y>.
- [17] Subhra Sankar Dhar and Weichi Wu. Comparing time varying regression quantiles under shift invariance. *Bernoulli*, 29(2):1527–1554, 2023. ISSN 1350-7265,1573-9759. doi: 10.3150/22-bej1509. URL <https://doi.org/10.3150/22-bej1509>.
- [18] Subhra Sankar Dhar, Prashant Jha, and Prabrisha Rakshit. The trimmed mean in non-parametric regression function estimation. *Theory Probab. Math. Statist.*, pages 133–158, 2022. ISSN 0094-9000,1547-7363. doi: 10.1090/tpms/1174. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/tpms/1174>.
- [19] Bernd Fitzenberger. A note on estimating censored quantile regressions. Discussion Paper 14, Center of International Labor Economics, University of Konstanz, 1994.
- [20] Bernd Fitzenberger. The moving blocks bootstrap and robust inference for linear least squares and quantile regressions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 82(2):235–287, 1998. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4076\(97\)00058-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4076(97)00058-4).
- [21] Brigham R. Frandsen. Treatment effects with censoring and endogeneity. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 110(512):1745–1752, 2015. ISSN 0162-1459,1537-274X. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2015.1017577. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2015.1017577>.
- [22] A. R. Gallant and H. White. *A Unified Theory of Estimation and Inference for Nonlinear Dynamic Models*. Basil Blackwell, New York, 1988.
- [23] C. Gutenbrunner and J. Jureckova. Regression rank scores and regression quantiles. *The Annals of Statistics*, 20(1):305–330, 1992. ISSN 00905364.

- [24] Frank R. Hampel, Elvezio M. Ronchetti, Peter J. Rousseeuw, and Werner A. Stahel. *Robust statistics*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1986. ISBN 0-471-82921-8. The approach based on influence functions.
- [25] Han Hong and Elie Tamer. Inference in censored models with endogenous regressors. *Econometrica*, 71(3):905–932, 2003. ISSN 00129682, 14680262.
- [26] Bo E Honoré and Luojia Hu. Estimation of cross sectional and panel data censored regression models with endogeneity. *Journal of Econometrics*, 122(2):293–316, 2004. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2003.06.001>.
- [27] Ola Hössjer and Måns Karlsson. On the use of l-functionals in regression models. *Open Mathematics*, 21(1):20220597, 2023. doi: doi:10.1515/math-2022-0597. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/math-2022-0597>.
- [28] Shakeeb Khan and Elie Tamer. Inference on endogenously censored regression models using conditional moment inequalities. *Journal of Econometrics*, 152(2):104–119, 2009. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2009.01.006>. Nonparametric and Robust Methods in Econometrics.
- [29] Daniel Kim, Christopher Baum, Michael Ganz, S Subramanian, and Ichiro Kawachi. The contextual effects of social capital on health: A cross-national instrumental variable analysis. *Social science and medicine (1982)*, 73:1689–97, 10 2011. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.09.019.
- [30] Keith Knight. Limiting distributions for L_1 regression estimators under general conditions. *Ann. Statist.*, 26(2):755–770, 1998. ISSN 0090-5364,2168-8966. doi: 10.1214/aos/1028144858. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1028144858>.
- [31] Roger Koenker and Gilbert Bassett, Jr. Regression quantiles. *Econometrica*, 46(1):33–50, 1978. ISSN 0012-9682,1468-0262. doi: 10.2307/1913643. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/1913643>.
- [32] Roger Koenker and Gilbert Bassett, Jr. Robust tests for heteroscedasticity based on regression quantiles. *Econometrica*, 50(1):43–61, 1982. ISSN 0012-9682,1468-0262. doi: 10.2307/1912528. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/1912528>.
- [33] Roger Koenker and Stephen Portnoy. L-estimation for linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82(399):851–857, 1987. ISSN 01621459.
- [34] Myoung-Jae Lee. Winsorized mean estimator for censored regression. *Econometric Theory*, 8(3): 368–382, 1992. ISSN 02664666, 14694360.
- [35] Myoung-jae Lee. Instrument residual estimator for any response variable with endogenous binary treatment. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 83(3):612–635, 2021. ISSN 1369-7412,1467-9868. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12442. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12442>.

- [36] Jiarui Lu and Hongzhe Li. Hypothesis testing in high-dimensional instrumental variables regression with an application to genomics data. *Statist. Sinica*, 32:613–633, 2021. ISSN 1017-0405,1996-8507. doi: 10.1007/s11045-020-00752-x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11045-020-00752-x>.
- [37] Whitney K. Newey. Efficient estimation of limited dependent variable models with endogenous explanatory variables. *Journal of Econometrics*, 36(3):231–250, 1987. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(87\)90001-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(87)90001-7).
- [38] James L Powell. Least absolute deviations estimation for the censored regression model. *Journal of Econometrics*, 25(3):303–325, 1984. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(84\)90004-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(84)90004-6).
- [39] James L. Powell. Censored regression quantiles. *Journal of Econometrics*, 32(1):143–155, 1986. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(86\)90016-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(86)90016-3).
- [40] James L. Powell. Symmetrically trimmed least squares estimation for tobit models. *Econometrica*, 54(6):1435–1460, 1986. ISSN 00129682, 14680262.
- [41] Douglas Rivers and Quang H. Vuong. Limited information estimators and exogeneity tests for simultaneous probit models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 39(3):347–366, 1988. ISSN 0304-4076. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(88\)90063-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(88)90063-2).
- [42] Robert Serfling. *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*. Wiley, 1980. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:122686903>.
- [43] Shalabh and Subhra Sankar Dhar. Testing the goodness of fit in instrumental variables models. In *G Families of Probability Distributions*, pages 330–343. Taylor & Francis, 2023.
- [44] Swati Shukla, Subhra Sankar Dhar, and Shalabh. M-estimation in censored regression model using instrumental variables under endogeneity. 2023. Under revision.
- [45] Richard J. Smith and Richard W. Blundell. An exogeneity test for a simultaneous equation tobit model with an application to labor supply. *Econometrica*, 54(3):679–685, 1986. ISSN 00129682, 14680262.
- [46] Luke Taylor and Taisuke Otsu. Estimation of nonseparable models with censored dependent variables and endogenous regressors. *Econometric Rev.*, 38(1):4–24, 2019. ISSN 0747-4938,1532-4168. doi: 10.1080/07474938.2016.1235310. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/07474938.2016.1235310>.
- [47] Aad W. van der Vaart and Jon A. Wellner. *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996. ISBN 0-387-94640-3. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4757-2545-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-2545-2>. With applications to statistics.
- [48] Aad W. van der Vaart and Jon A. Wellner. *Independence Empirical Processes*, pages 367–371. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1996. ISBN 978-1-4757-2545-2. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4757-2545-2_34. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-2545-2_34.

- [49] Stijn Vansteelandt and Vanessa Didelez. Improving the robustness and efficiency of covariate-adjusted linear instrumental variable estimators. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 45:941 – 961, 2018.
- [50] V. N. Vapnik and A. Ja. Červonenkis. The uniform convergence of frequencies of the appearance of events to their probabilities. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.*, 16:264–279, 1971. ISSN 0040-361x.
- [51] Wenjie Wang and Yichong Zhang. Wild bootstrap inference for instrumental variables regressions with weak and few clusters. *J. Econometrics*, 241(1):Paper No. 105727, 2024. ISSN 0304-4076,1872-6895. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2024.105727. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2024.105727>.
- [52] Halbert White. Nonlinear regression on cross-section data. *Econometrica*, 48(3):721–746, 1980. ISSN 00129682, 14680262.
- [53] Zhou Zhou and Xiaofeng Shao. Inference for linear models with dependent errors. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 75(2):323–343, 2013. ISSN 13697412, 14679868.