

A Dimension-Agnostic Bootstrap Anderson-Rubin Test For Instrumental Variable Regressions*

Dennis Lim[†]Wenjie Wang[‡]Yichong Zhang[§]

December 3, 2024

Abstract

Weak-identification-robust Anderson-Rubin (AR) tests for instrumental variable (IV) regressions are typically developed separately depending on whether the number of IVs is treated as fixed or increasing with the sample size. These tests rely on distinct test statistics and critical values. To apply them, researchers are forced to take a stance on the asymptotic behavior of the number of IVs, which can be ambiguous when the number is moderate. In this paper, we propose a bootstrap-based, dimension-agnostic AR test. By deriving strong approximations for the test statistic and its bootstrap counterpart, we show that our new test has a correct asymptotic size regardless of whether the number of IVs is fixed or increasing - allowing, but not requiring, the number of IVs to exceed the sample size. We also analyze the power properties of the proposed uniformly valid test under both fixed and increasing numbers of IVs.

Keywords: Weak Identification, Anderson-Rubin Test, Strong Approximation, Quadratic Form, Bootstrap, High-Dimensional Instrumental Variables

JEL Classification: C12, C36, C55

*We are grateful to Liyu Dou, Qingliang Fan, Jia Li, Yifan Li, Ruixuan Liu, Whitney Newey, Ryo Okui, Katsumi Shimotsu, Kevin Song, Jun Yu, Kai Zhang, and all the participants at the CUHK Econometrics Workshop, SMU Econometrics Workshop, the 2024 Asian Meeting of the Econometric Society in China, and the 18th International Symposium on Econometric Theory and Applications for their valuable comments. All errors are our own.

[†]Singapore Management University. E-mail address: dennis.lim.2019@phdecons.smu.edu.sg.

[‡]Division of Economics, School of Social Sciences, Nanyang Technological University. HSS-04-65, 14 Nanyang Drive, Singapore 637332. E-mail address: wang.wj@ntu.edu.sg.

[§]Singapore Management University. E-mail address: yczhang@smu.edu.sg.

1 Introduction

Weak and numerous instruments remain persistent concerns in instrumental variable (IV) regressions across various fields. Surveys by [Andrews, Stock, and Sun \(2019\)](#) and [Lee, McCrary, Moreira, and Porter \(2022\)](#) find that a considerable number of IV regressions in the *American Economic Review* report first-stage F-statistics below 10. In addition, empirical studies often involve many instruments, such as the 180 IVs used by [Angrist and Krueger \(1991\)](#) to examine the effect of schooling on wages. In “judge design” studies, the number of instruments (number of judges) is typically proportional to the sample size ([Mikusheva and Sun, 2022](#)).¹ Similar patterns of many instruments occur in Fama-MacBeth regressions ([Fama and MacBeth, 1973](#); [Shanken, 1992](#)), shift-share IVs ([Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift, 2020](#)), wind-direction IVs ([Deryugina, Heutel, Miller, Molitor, and Reif, 2019](#); [Bondy, Roth, and Sager, 2020](#)), granular IVs ([Gabaix and Koijen, 2024](#)), local average treatment effect estimation ([Blandhol, Bonney, Mogstad, and Torgovitsky, 2022](#); [Boot and Nibbering, 2024](#); [Słoczyński, 2024](#)), and Mendelian randomization ([Davey Smith and Ebrahim, 2003](#); [Davies, von Hinke Kessler Scholder, Farbmacher, Burgess, Windmeijer, and Smith, 2015](#)).

However, existing weak-identification-robust inference methods for IV regressions are either based on an asymptotic framework in which the number of instruments K is treated as fixed² or on an alternative one that allows K to diverge to infinity with the sample size.³ These inference methods compare distinct test statistics with distinct critical values so that procedures formulated under the fixed- K asymptotics generally do not have correct size control under the diverging- K asymptotics and vice versa. An empirical researcher is, therefore, forced to take a stance on the asymptotic regime of the number of instruments to implement them. However, when K is moderate, it is unclear which test the researcher should use.

Motivated by this challenge, we propose a bootstrap-based, dimension-agnostic AR test. First, by deriving strong approximations for the proposed test statistic and its bootstrap counterpart (under both the null and alternative hypotheses), we show that the new bootstrap test has a correct asymptotic size, regardless of whether the number of IVs is fixed or diverging. Our proof, which relies on the Lindeberg swapping strategy, contributes a general result on the strong approximation for quadratic forms with independent and heteroskedastic errors. Additionally, our (conditional) strong approximation derivation for bootstrap statistics involving quadratic forms is novel and may

¹E.g., see [Kling \(2006\)](#), [Doyle Jr. \(2007\)](#), [Dahl, Kostøl, and Mogstad \(2014\)](#), [Dobbie, Goldin, and Yang \(2018\)](#), [Sampat and Williams \(2019\)](#), [Agan, Doleac, and Harvey \(2023\)](#), [Frandsen, Lefgren, and Leslie \(2023\)](#), [Chyn, Frandsen, and Leslie \(2024\)](#) and the references therein.

²E.g., see [Staiger and Stock \(1997\)](#), [Stock and Wright \(2000\)](#), [Kleibergen \(2002, 2005\)](#), [Moreira \(2003\)](#), [Andrews and Cheng \(2012\)](#), [Andrews and Mikusheva \(2016\)](#), [Andrews \(2018\)](#), [Andrews and Guggenberger \(2019\)](#), [Moreira and Moreira \(2019\)](#), among others.

³E.g., see [Andrews and Stock \(2007\)](#), [Newey and Windmeijer \(2009\)](#), [Anatolyev and Gospodinov \(2011\)](#), [Crudu, Mellace, and Sándor \(2021\)](#), [Mikusheva and Sun \(2022\)](#), [Matsushita and Otsu \(2024\)](#), [Lim, Wang, and Zhang \(2024\)](#), [Dovi, Kock, and Mavroeidis \(2024\)](#), among others.

be of independent interest. Second, by employing a ridge-regularized projection matrix, our AR test remains valid in high-dimensional cases where K exceeds the sample size n , making it robust across all asymptotic regimes considered in the literature. Our characterization of the errors in strong approximation additionally offers a theoretically sound basis for selecting the ridge regularizer without taking a stance on the specific regime of the number of IVs. Third, we analyze the power properties of the proposed uniformly valid test under both fixed and diverging K scenarios. Fourth, simulation experiments and an empirical application to the dataset of [Card \(2009\)](#) confirm our bootstrap test’s excellent size and power performance compared to alternative methods.

Relation to the literature: For weak-identification-robust inference based on the classical AR test, [Andrews and Stock \(2007\)](#) show its validity under many instruments, but their IV model is homoskedastic and requires the number of instruments to diverge slower than the cube root of the sample size ($K^3/n \rightarrow 0$). [Newey and Windmeijer \(2009\)](#) proposed a GMM-AR test under many (weak) moment conditions but imposed the same rate condition on K . [Anatolyev and Gospodinov \(2011\)](#) constructed a modified AR test that allows the number of instruments to be proportional to the sample size but requires homoskedastic errors, and [Kaffo and Wang \(2017\)](#) proposed a bootstrap version of [Anatolyev and Gospodinov \(2011\)](#)’s test. For estimation with many instruments, [Carrasco \(2012\)](#), [Carrasco and Tchuente \(2015, 2016a\)](#), [Hansen and Kozbur \(2014\)](#), and [Carrasco and Doukali \(2017\)](#) proposed regularization approaches for two-stage least squares, limited information maximum likelihood, and jackknife IV estimators. Furthermore, [Carrasco and Tchuente \(2016b\)](#) first proposed a ridge-regularized AR test that allows for K being larger than n with homoskedastic errors. [Maurice J. G. Bun and Poldermans \(2020\)](#) compared the centered and uncentered GMM-AR test and identified a missing degrees-of-freedom correction when $K/n \rightarrow 0$. Recently, [Crudu et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Mikusheva and Sun \(2022\)](#) proposed jackknifed versions of the AR test in a model with many instruments and general heteroskedasticity. [Dovì et al. \(2024\)](#) developed a ridge-regularized version of the jackknife AR test. However, the jackknife AR tests are based on standard normal critical values that require K to diverge to infinity. Therefore, their tests may not have the correct size under heteroskedasticity and fixed K . [Tuvaandorj \(2024, Section 2.3\)](#) established the validity of a permutation AR test under heteroskedasticity and diverging K , requiring $K^3/n \rightarrow 0$. In contrast to the above methods, our proposed bootstrap AR test remains valid with heteroskedastic errors uniformly across a broad asymptotic regime for K , spanning from fixed to diverging faster than the sample size.

Furthermore, [Belloni, Chen, Chernozhukov, and Hansen \(2012\)](#) proposed a Lasso-based method for selecting optimal instruments, valid under high-dimensional IVs and heteroskedasticity, but requiring strong identification and sparse first-stage regressions. However, [Wüthrich and Zhu \(2023\)](#) showed that both Lasso and debiased Lasso linear regressions can suffer from significant omitted variable bias, even when the coefficient vector is sparse and the sample size exceeds the number of controls. In such cases, the “long regression,” which includes all regressors, often outperforms

the Lasso-based methods. [Kolesár, Müller, and Roelsgaard \(2023\)](#) similarly recommended using the “long regression” unless the number of regressors is comparable to or exceeds the sample size. [Belloni et al. \(2012\)](#) also proposed a weak-identification-robust sup-score test that is dimension-agnostic and does not rely on sparsity. Similar to [Dovì et al. \(2024\)](#), our simulation study shows that the power of our ridge-regularized bootstrap AR test matches the sup-score test when IVs have strong but sparse signals while offering substantially more power when the signal is weak but dense. [Navjeevan \(2023\)](#) introduced a jackknife version of the [Kleibergen \(2002\)](#)’s K test and combined it with the sup-score test, but his method relies on a sparse ℓ_1 -regularized estimation of $\rho(Z_i)$, the conditional correlation between the endogenous variable and the outcome error. Without the sparsity assumption, the estimation of $\rho(Z_i)$ may be inconsistent when the dimension of Z_i is large. [Boot and Ligtenberg \(2023\)](#) developed a dimension-robust AR test based on continuous updating but relied on an invariance assumption. In contrast to the abovementioned approaches, our dimension-robust AR test procedure allows for many instruments and heteroskedastic errors but does not rely on invariance or sparsity assumptions.

Our paper also relates to the literature on bootstrap inference for IV regressions. In particular, it is found in this literature that when implemented appropriately, bootstrap approaches may substantially improve the inference accuracy for IV models, including the cases where IVs may be rather weak; for example, see [Davidson and MacKinnon \(2008, 2010, 2014\)](#), [Moreira, Porter, and Suarez \(2009\)](#), [Wang and Kaffo \(2016\)](#), [Finlay and Magnusson \(2019\)](#), [Roodman, Nielsen, MacKinnon, and Webb \(2019\)](#), [Young \(2022\)](#), and [Wang and Zhang \(2024\)](#), among others. However, no existing study has uniformly established the bootstrap validity with regard to the number of IVs. We fill this gap by deriving strong approximation results for both test statistic and its bootstrap counterpart. The strong approximation for the AR statistic is related to the analysis of quadratic forms by [Horowitz and Spokoiny \(2001\)](#). In addition, our results of (conditional) strong approximation for bootstrap statistics with a quadratic form are, based on our best knowledge, new to the literature.

Lastly, [Anatolyev and Solvsten \(2023\)](#) introduced an analytical, dimension-agnostic Wald test for linear regressions by analyzing the asymptotic behavior of quadratic forms separately under fixed and growing numbers of restrictions being tested. In contrast, our approach focuses on linear IV regressions and is bootstrap-based. Furthermore, we provide unified strong approximations for both the test statistic and the bootstrap critical values, which hold across all asymptotic regimes.

Structure of the paper: Section 2 makes precise the model setup and provides the testing procedure for our dimension-robust AR test statistic. Sections 3 and 4 provide the strong approximation results under both null and alternative for our test statistic and its bootstrap counterpart, respectively. We derive the power properties of our test under the fixed- K and diverging- K asymptotics, respectively, in Section 5. Section 6 presents the results of Monte Carlo simulations and section 7 applies our test to an empirical application. Proofs of Theorems and Corollaries stated in the main

text are given in the Appendix, along with additional lemmas.

Notations: We denote by $[n]$ the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and use $\|A\|_{op}$ and $\|A\|_F$ to refer to the operator and Frobenius norms of a matrix A , respectively.

2 Setup and Testing Procedure

2.1 Setup

Consider the linear instrumental variable regression

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Y}_i &= \tilde{X}_i\beta + W_i^\top\Gamma + \tilde{e}_i \\ \tilde{X}_i &= \tilde{\Pi}_i + \tilde{v}_i,\end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

where \tilde{X}_i denotes a scalar endogenous variable and $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^L$ denotes the exogenous control variables. In addition, we have K -dimensional instrumental variables (IVs) denoted as \tilde{Z}_i , and $\tilde{\Pi}_i \equiv \mathbb{E}(\tilde{X}_i|\tilde{Z}_i, W_i)$. We stack \tilde{Z}_i^\top up and denote the resulting $n \times K_n$ matrix \tilde{Z} . We define $\tilde{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\tilde{\Pi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\tilde{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times L}$ in the same manner. Throughout the paper, we treat L as fixed with respect to the sample size n and require W to be of full rank so that its projection matrix $P_W = W(W^\top W)^{-1}W^\top$ is well defined. We allow, but do not require, K_n to increase with n . Specifically, the dimension of Z can be fixed, grow proportional to, or even faster than n .

We focus on the model with a scalar endogenous variable for two reasons. First, in many empirical applications of IV regressions, there is only one endogenous variable (as can be seen from the surveys by [Andrews et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Lee et al. \(2022\)](#)). Second, the strong approximation results derived in Sections 3 and 4 extend directly to the general case of full-vector inference with multiple endogenous variables. Additionally, for the dimension-robust subvector inference, one may use a projection approach ([Dufour and Taamouti, 2005](#)) after implementing our test on the whole vector of endogenous variables.⁴

To proceed, we first partial out the exogenous control variables W from our IV regressions. Specifically, we stack up $(Y_i, X_i, e_i, \Pi_i, v_i)$ to (Y, X, e, Π, v) , which are defined as $Y = M_W\tilde{Y}$, $X = M_W\tilde{X}$, $\Pi = M_W\tilde{\Pi}$, $e = M_W\tilde{e}$, and $v = M_W\tilde{v}$, where $M_W = I_n - P_W$ and I_n is an $n \times n$ identity matrix. In addition, we define $Z = M_W\tilde{Z}$. Then, the IV model in (2.1) can be rewritten as

$$Y_i = X_i\beta + e_i$$

⁴Alternative subvector inference methods for IV regressions (e.g., see [Guggenberger, Kleibergen, Mavroeidis, and Chen \(2012\)](#), [Andrews \(2017\)](#), and [Guggenberger, Kleibergen, and Mavroeidis \(2019, 2021\)](#)) provide a power improvement over the projection approach under fixed K . However, whether they can be applied to the current setting is unclear. Also, [Wang and Doko Tchatoka \(2018\)](#) and [Wang \(2020\)](#) show that bootstrap tests based on the standard subvector AR statistic may not be robust to weak identification even under fixed K and conditional homoskedasticity.

$$X_i = \Pi_i + v_i. \quad (2.2)$$

In the following, we develop a bootstrap AR test that is dimension-agnostic, meaning that it achieves a correct asymptotic size and has desirable power properties against alternatives no matter the dimension of IVs, K_n , is fixed or diverging to infinity at a rate that is slower, proportional, or faster than the sample size. Throughout our analysis, we treat (Z, W) as fixed, which is equivalent to taking all expectations and probability measures conditionally on (Z, W) .

2.2 Test Statistic

Given that we allow K_n to be greater than n , the matrix $Z^\top Z$ is not necessarily invertible. Therefore, we define $P_\lambda = Z(Z^\top Z + \lambda I_{K_n})^{-1} Z^\top$ as the ridge-regularized projection matrix of Z with some ridge penalty λ that will be chosen based on Z only. As we treat the instruments and control variables as fixed, so are the ridge-regularizer λ and matrix P_λ . The (i, j) element of P_λ is denoted as $P_{\lambda,ij}$. Further denote $e_i(\beta_0) = Y_i - X_i\beta_0$. Then, our dimension-agnostic AR test statistic is written as

$$\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} e_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda,ij} e_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$K_\lambda = \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda,ij}^2. \quad (2.4)$$

The regularizer λ is chosen as

$$\lambda = \max \left\{ \theta \in [0, \bar{\theta}] : \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} P_{\theta,ii}^2}{K_\theta} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\theta,ij}^2}{K_\theta} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $P_\theta = Z(Z^\top Z + \theta I_{K_n})^{-1} Z^\top$, $P_{\theta,ij}$ is the (i, j) entry of P_θ , $\bar{\theta} = \|Z^\top Z\|_{op}$, and K_θ is defined in (2.4) with λ replaced by θ . We view $\frac{c}{0} = +\infty$ for any $c > 0$.

We select the regularizer λ as the largest value over the interval $[0, \bar{\theta}]$ that both $\frac{\max_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda,ii}^2}{K_\lambda}$ and $\frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda,ij}^2}{K_\lambda}$ remain small. These are two critical conditions for ensuring the validity of our strong approximation results for both the test statistic and the bootstrap critical value. Moreover, the definitions of K_λ and $P_{\lambda,ij}$ imply that both $\frac{\max_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda,ii}^2}{K_\lambda}$ and $\frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda,ij}^2}{K_\lambda}$ lie within $[0, 1]$ and are invariant to the scaling of Z_i . Lastly, since the choice of λ depends solely on the instruments, which are treated as fixed (i.e., non-random, or conditioned upon), it does not introduce any model selection bias.

2.3 Bootstrap Critical Value

To implement the dimension-agnostic test, we propose to use bootstrap critical values. Specifically, let $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ be an independent sequence of random variables with zero mean and unit variance that are generated independently from the samples. Our bootstrap AR test statistic is denoted as $\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0)$ and defined as

$$\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \eta_i e_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} \eta_j e_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}. \quad (2.6)$$

Then, the bootstrap critical value is denoted as $\widehat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0)$ and defined as the $(1 - \alpha)$ -th percentile of $\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0)$ conditional on data, where α is the nominal level of rejection under the null. We reject the null hypothesis of $\beta = \beta_0$ if

$$\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) > \widehat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0).$$

3 Strong Approximation of the Test Statistic

Sections 3 and 4 are concerned with the conditions under which the null distribution of the test statistic defined in (2.3) can be approximated by its bootstrap counterpart, no matter whether the dimension K_n of the IVs is fixed or diverging with the sample size. We make the following assumptions on the data-generating process (DGP) to establish this result.

Assumption 1. 1. Suppose (2.1) holds in which W and Z are treated as fixed, $\{\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{v}_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ are independent, mean zero, but potentially heteroskedastic.

2. There exist constants c, C such that $\max_{i \in [n]} \|W_i\|_\infty \leq C < \infty$, $\max_{i \in [n]} |\tilde{\Pi}_i| \leq C < \infty$, and

$$\lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{n} W^\top W \right) \geq c > 0,$$

where $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ for a positive semi-definite matrix A denotes A 's minimum eigenvalue.

3. There exist constants $C \in (0, \infty)$ and $q > 6$ such that $\max_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{e}_i^{2q} + X_i^{2q}) \leq C$.

4. Let $\tilde{\sigma}_i^2 = \mathbb{E}\tilde{e}_i^2$. Then, there exists a constant $\underline{c} > 0$ such that $\min_{i \in [n]} \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 \geq \underline{c}$.

5. Suppose $p_n = \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2}{K_\lambda}$ and $q_n = \max_{i \in [n]} \frac{P_{\lambda, ii}^2}{K_\lambda}$. Then, we have $p_n n^{3/q} = o(1)$ and $q_n = o(1)$.

6. Suppose that $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ are i.i.d. and independent of data, have mean zero, unit variance, and sub-Gaussian tail in the sense that $\inf \left\{ u > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{|\eta|}{u} \right)^2 \leq 2 \right\} \leq C < \infty$ for some fixed constant $C \in (0, \infty)$.

Assumptions 1.1–1.4 are standard regularity conditions. Assumption 1.5 requires p_n and q_n to vanish sufficiently fast. Consider the case where there is no ridge regularization ($\lambda = 0$), and the projection matrix is well defined ($K_n < n$). In this case, $\sum_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda, ii} = K_n$ and $K_\lambda = K_n - \sum_{i \in [n]} (P_{\lambda, ii})^2$. If we assume the diagonal elements of P_λ are well-balanced, then we have

$$\max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \leq \max_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda, ii} \leq CK_n/n,$$

for some constant $C > 0$, and thus, $p_n = O(n^{-1})$ and $q_n = O(n^{-1})$. We emphasize that this result holds no matter whether K_n is fixed or diverging at a rate that is not faster than n . Furthermore, when K_n is larger than n , our suggestion of the ridge-regularizer λ in (2.5) implies that Assumption 1.5 holds if $q > 6$. Assumption 1.6 requires the bootstrap random variable η_i to have a sub-Gaussian tail. In practice, we suggest using standard normal or Rademacher random variables, both of which satisfy this requirement.

To proceed, we need to introduce some more notation. Define $\Delta = \beta - \beta_0$, $\tilde{\tau}_i = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{e}_i \tilde{v}_i)$, $\tilde{\zeta}_i^2 = \mathbb{E}\tilde{v}_i^2$, $\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) = \check{e}_i(\beta_0) + \Pi_i \Delta$, and $\check{e}_i(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_i + \tilde{v}_i \Delta$. Then, we denote

$$\check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) = \text{var}(\check{e}_i(\beta_0)) = \mathbb{E}\check{e}_i^2(\beta_0) = \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 + 2\Delta\tilde{\tau}_i + \Delta^2\tilde{\zeta}_i^2,$$

and

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) = \mathbb{E}\tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) = \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 + 2\Delta\tilde{\tau}_i + \Delta^2(\tilde{\zeta}_i^2 + \Pi_i^2).$$

In addition, let

$$Q(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}, \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$Q^*(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} g_i \tilde{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} g_j \tilde{\sigma}_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\{g_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ are i.i.d. standard normal random variables that are generated independent of data. The following theorem shows that our proposed AR test statistic $\hat{Q}(\beta_0)$ can be strongly approximated by $Q(\beta_0)$ in Kolmogorov distance. Furthermore, Theorem 4.1 in the next section shows the bootstrap statistic $\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0)$ can be strongly approximated by $Q^*(\beta_0)$ in Kolmogorov distance conditionally on data.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds, and $\|\Pi\|_2^2 \Delta^2 / \sqrt{K_\lambda}$ is bounded. Then, we have*

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \right| = o_P(1).$$

Remark 3.1. We note that $Q(\beta_0)$ is implicitly indexed by the sample size n , which explains why we call it a strong approximation rather than a limit of our AR statistic $\widehat{Q}(\beta_0)$.

Remark 3.2. Theorem 3.1 is valid under both the null and alternative hypotheses. The nature of the alternatives depends on the magnitude of $\|\Pi\|_2^2 / \sqrt{K_\lambda}$. When K_n , and thus, K_λ is bounded, we have weak (strong) identification when the concentration parameter $\|\Pi\|_2^2$ is bounded (diverging). When K_λ is diverging, as shown by Mikusheva and Sun (2022), weak (strong) identification arises when the concentration parameter $\|\Pi\|_2^2 / \sqrt{K_\lambda}$ is bounded (diverging). Under either regime with regard to K_λ , Theorem 3.1 accommodates (i) fixed alternatives under weak identification and (ii) local alternatives scaled by the square root of the concentration parameter under strong identification.

4 Strong Approximation of the Bootstrap Statistic

This section concerns the strong approximation of the bootstrap statistic defined in Section 2.3 in Kolmogorov distance conditionally on data. The approximation in Theorem 4.1 is the same as that for the original statistic under the null hypothesis, as established in Theorem 3.1, which directly implies that the proposed test with bootstrap critical values achieves a correct asymptotic size. Such a result holds no matter whether the dimension of IVs K_n is fixed or diverging to infinity.

Theorem 4.1. *Let \mathcal{D} denote all observations in our sample. Suppose Assumption 1 holds and Δ is bounded. Then, we have*

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y) \right| = o_P(1).$$

Remark 4.1. Theorem 4.1 remains valid under both the null and alternative hypotheses. In contrast to Theorem 3.1, it accommodates fixed alternatives even in the presence of strong identification (without requiring $\|\Pi\|_2^2 \Delta^2 / \sqrt{K_\lambda}$ to be bounded). Importantly, we note that the alternative hypothesis affects $Q(\beta_0)$ and $Q^*(\beta_0)$ differently – introducing non-centrality bias in the former and variance in the latter (e.g., see the definitions of $Q(\beta_0)$ in (3.1) and $Q^*(\beta_0)$ in (3.2), respectively). This distinction underpins the power of our dimension-agnostic AR test, which will be analyzed in detail in the following section.

Remark 4.2. Theorem 4.1 can be viewed as a general result of strong approximation for the bootstrap version of the quadratic forms. The proof extends the Lindeberg swapping strategy mentioned in the previous section. Indeed, compared with Theorem 3.1, it is substantially more involved to establish Theorem 4.1 because the second moment of the bootstrap statistic $\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0)$ conditional on data is random and does not exactly match that of its strong approximation (i.e., $Q^*(\beta_0)$). We rely on the concentration inequalities for quadratic forms (i.e., Hanson-Wright inequality) and linear forms of martingale difference sequence to bound the approximation error in Kolmogorov distance due to the mismatch of the second moments. This technique seems new to the literature and may be of independent interest.

Remark 4.3. In addition, we observe from (3.1)-(3.2) that $Q(\beta_0)$ and $Q^*(\beta_0)$ have the same marginal distribution under the null hypothesis (i.e., $\Delta = 0$). This means that, under the null, the bootstrap statistic closely approximates the test statistic in Kolmogorov distance when conditioned on the data, whether K_n is fixed or diverging. This equivalence forms the basis for our bootstrap test to achieve the correct size. To rigorously validate this assertion, the following regularity condition is required.

Assumption 2. Denote $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(\beta_0) = \inf\{y \in \mathfrak{R} : 1 - \alpha \leq F_{\beta_0}(y)\}$, where $F_{\beta_0}(y) = \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y)$. Let the ε -neighborhood around $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(\beta_0)$ be $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{C}_\alpha(\beta_0), \varepsilon)$. Then, under the null, the density of $Q(\beta_0)$ exists on the neighborhood $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{C}_\alpha(\beta_0), \varepsilon)$ and is denoted as $f_{\beta_0, n}(\cdot)$. In addition, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{C}_\alpha(\beta_0), \varepsilon)} f_{\beta_0, n}(y) \geq \underline{c} > 0,$$

where $\underline{c} > 0$ is a fixed constant.

Corollary 4.1. Suppose we are under the null hypothesis $\beta = \beta_0$ and Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) > \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha^*(\beta_0)) \rightarrow \alpha.$$

Remark 4.4. Our dimension-agnostic AR test and bootstrap strong approximation results are based on a multiplier bootstrap procedure. When test statistics admit a linear expansion, the empirical bootstrap (nonparametric bootstrap; e.g., Hall and Horowitz (1996), Andrews (2002)) is asymptotically equivalent to the multiplier bootstrap with a Poisson weight. See, for example, Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Chapter 3.6). However, whether such an equivalence still holds for quadratic forms is unclear.

Remark 4.5. Although we focus on developing a dimension-robust AR test in this paper, the strong approximation results for a quadratic form (i.e., Theorem 3.1) and its bootstrap counterpart

(i.e., Theorem 4.1) with general heteroskedasticity may have many other potential applications. For example, in the context of linear regression models, Kolesár et al. (2023) proposed a test procedure of the sparsity assumption, which compares the sum of squared Lasso or post-Lasso residuals with that of OLS residuals from a “long regression.” They let the number of regressors diverge with the sample size to obtain a standard normal approximation for the F -statistic (which is also of a quadratic form; e.g., see Lemma 3 of Section 5.2 in their paper). We conjecture that it is possible to develop a dimension-robust version of the test of sparsity by applying our strong approximations, given the same structure of the test statistics. Our approximation results may also be useful in other applications involving quadratic forms with heteroskedasticity, such as analysis of variance and test of linear restrictions with many regressors (e.g., see Kline, Saggio, and Sølvesten (2020) and Anatolyev and Solvsten (2023)).

5 Asymptotic Power

In this section, we discuss the power of the bootstrap inference by focusing on two separate cases: (1) K_λ diverges and (2) K_λ is bounded. Given that K_λ is bounded from above by $\min(K_n, n)$, case (1) corresponds to the case where K_n diverges, potentially even faster than the sample size. Alternatively, when $K_n = K$ is fixed, K_λ must be bounded and, thus, belongs to case (2).

5.1 The Case with Diverging K_λ

To proceed, we let

$$\Psi(\beta_0) = \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \check{\sigma}_j^2(\beta_0)}{K_\lambda},$$

where $\check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) = \text{var}(\tilde{e}_i + \Delta \tilde{v}_i) = \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 + 2\Delta \tilde{\tau}_i + \Delta^2 \tilde{\zeta}_i^2$.

Assumption 3. 1. $K_\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, and $\|\Pi\|_2^2 \Delta^2 / \sqrt{K_\lambda}$ is bounded.

2. Δ and $\max_{i \in [n]} |\Pi_i|$ are bounded.

3. $\Psi^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ij} \Pi_j \Delta^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \rightarrow \mu(\beta_0)$.

Theorem 5.1. Suppose Assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) > \hat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0)) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}(\mu(\beta_0), 1) > \mathcal{Z}(1 - \alpha)),$$

where $\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1)$ is a normal random variable with mean μ and unit variance and $\mathcal{Z}(1 - \alpha)$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of a standard normal random variable.

Remark 5.1. Theorem 5.1 implies that when $K < n$ and $\lambda = 0$ (i.e., without ridge regularization), the local power of our bootstrap AR test is asymptotically equivalent to that of the jackknife AR tests proposed by Crudu et al. (2021) and Mikusheva and Sun (2022).⁵ On the other hand, simulations in Section 6 suggest that our bootstrap AR test with the proposed regularizer in (2.5) can achieve substantial power improvement over the jackknife AR tests under many instruments.

5.2 The Case with Fixed K_λ

In this section, we consider the power property of our bootstrap AR test in the asymptotic framework that the dimension of Z (i.e., K) is fixed. To rigorously state the regularity conditions, we consider the singular value decomposition of Z as

$$Z = \mathcal{U}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{V}^\top,$$

where $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{U}^\top \mathcal{U} = I_n$, $\mathcal{S} = [S_0, 0_{K, n-K}]^\top$, S_0 is a diagonal matrix of non-zero singular values, $0_{K, n-K} \in \mathfrak{R}^{K \times (n-K)}$ is a matrix of zeros, $\mathcal{V} \in \mathfrak{R}^{K \times K}$, and $\mathcal{V}^\top \mathcal{V} = I_K$. Denote $\mathcal{U} = [\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2]$ such that $\mathcal{U}_1 \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times K}$, $\mathcal{U}_2 \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times (n-K)}$, $\mathcal{U}_1^\top \mathcal{U}_1 = I_K$, $\mathcal{U}_1^\top \mathcal{U}_2 = 0_{K, n-K}$, and $\mathcal{U}_2^\top \mathcal{U}_2 = I_{n-K}$. Further denote $\Omega(\beta_0) = \mathcal{U}_1^\top \text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n^2(\beta_0))\mathcal{U}_1$ and the eigenvalue decomposition

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0) S_0 (S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 \Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} = \mathbb{U} \text{diag}(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K) \mathbb{U}^\top.$$

Last, denote $\nu(\beta_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{U}^\top \Omega^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \Delta \mathcal{U}_1^\top \Pi$.

Assumption 4. 1. Suppose the IVs Z have a fixed dimension K , $\max_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda, ii} = o(1)$, and $K_\lambda \geq c$ for some constant $c > 0$.

2. $\max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathcal{U}_{1, i}\|_2 = o(\sqrt{n})$, where $\mathcal{U}_{1, i}^\top \in \mathfrak{R}^{1 \times K}$ is the i -th row of \mathcal{U}_1 .
3. $\|\Pi\|_2^2 \Delta^2 / \sqrt{K_\lambda}$ is bounded.

The following theorem establishes our AR test's (local) power in the fixed K_λ scenario.

Theorem 5.2. Suppose Assumptions 1 and 4 hold. Then, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) > \widehat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0)) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0)) > \mathcal{C}_\omega(1 - \alpha)\right),$$

where $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K)$, $\{\chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0))\}_{k \in [K]}$ is a sequence of independent non-central chi-squared random variables with one degree of freedom and noncentrality parameter $\nu_k^2(\beta_0)$, $\nu_k(\beta_0)$ is the k -

⁵Crudu et al. (2021) and Mikusheva and Sun (2022) proposed different variance estimators for the jackknife AR statistic. Under local alternatives characterized under Assumption 3, the two variance estimators are asymptotically equivalent.

th element of $\nu(\beta_0)$, $\mathcal{C}_\omega(1 - \alpha)$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of a weighted chi-squared random variable $\sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2$, and $\{\chi_k^2\}_{k \in [K]}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. centered chi-squared random variables with one degree of freedom.

Next, we demonstrate that when K is fixed, our dimension-agnostic AR test is (asymptotically) admissible within a specific class of tests, which includes the standard (heteroskedasticity-robust) AR test designed for fixed K . This result implies that the power of our dimension-agnostic AR test is not uniformly dominated by the standard AR test. Conversely, as the standard AR test is also admissible in this class, it is not uniformly dominated by our test either.

Let

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(\beta_0) = \mathbb{U} \widehat{\Omega}^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \mathcal{U}_1^\top e(\beta_0), \quad (5.1)$$

and $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_k(\beta_0)$ be the k -th element of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(\beta_0)$, where $\widehat{\Omega}(\beta_0)$ is a consistent estimator of $\Omega(\beta_0)$. We observe that, in the scenario where K is fixed, the standard AR test rejects if

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}^\top(\beta_0) \widehat{\mathcal{G}}(\beta_0) = \sum_{k \in [K]} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_k^2(\beta_0) > \mathcal{C}_{\iota_K}(1 - \alpha), \quad (5.2)$$

where ι_K is a K -dimensional vector of ones and $\mathcal{C}_{\iota_K}(1 - \alpha)$ is just the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of the centered chi-squared random variable with K degrees of freedom.

We consider the class of tests as $\phi(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_K^2(\beta_0))$ such that $\phi(\cdot) \in \Phi_\alpha$ and

$$\Phi_\alpha = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\phi}(\mathcal{G}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{G}_K^2) : \mathbb{E} \tilde{\phi}(\mathcal{G}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{G}_K^2) \leq \alpha, \\ \text{the set of discontinuities of } \tilde{\phi}(\mathcal{G}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{G}_K^2) \text{ w.r.t.} \\ \mathcal{G}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{G}_K^2 \text{ has zero Lebesgue measure} \end{array} \right\}.$$

We also note that

$$\left(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_K^2(\beta_0) \right) \rightsquigarrow \left(\chi_1^2(\nu_1^2(\beta_0)), \dots, \chi_K^2(\nu_K^2(\beta_0)) \right),$$

where $\{\chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0))\}_{k \in [K]}$ is defined in Theorem 5.2. This means the power of any test $\phi(\cdot) \in \Phi_\alpha$ are determined by $\nu(\beta_0) \in \mathfrak{R}^K$.

Corollary 5.1. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 4 hold. In addition, let $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(\beta_0)$ be defined in (5.1), $\widehat{\Omega}(\beta_0) \xrightarrow{p} \Omega(\beta_0)$, and*

$$0 < c \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Omega(\beta_0)) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Omega(\beta_0)) \leq C < \infty.$$

Then, our bootstrap test $\phi_0 = 1\{\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) > \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_\alpha^(\beta_0)\}$ is asymptotically admissible w.r.t. Φ_α in the*

sense that if there exists a test $\phi^* \in \Phi_\alpha$ such that for all values of $\nu(\beta_0) \in \mathfrak{R}^K$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \phi^*(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_K^2(\beta_0)) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \phi_0,$$

then we must have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \phi^*(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_K^2(\beta_0)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \phi_0,$$

for all $\nu(\beta_0) \in \mathfrak{R}^K$.

Remark 5.2. Because the standard AR test defined in (5.2) belongs to Φ_α , Corollary 5.1 implies our bootstrap test ϕ_0 is not dominated by the standard AR test for all alternatives. In fact, the standard AR test is also admissible among the tests in Φ_α so that it is not dominated by ϕ_0 either. However, our bootstrap test is dimension-robust, while the standard AR test does not have the correct size under diverging K (simulations in Section 6 suggest that it can be very conservative as K increases).

Remark 5.3. Under strong identification against local alternatives, the K test proposed by Kleibergen (2002) is the uniformly most powerful unbiased test when the number of IVs K is treated as fixed and, thus, dominates both the standard AR and our test. However, the K test is not dimension-robust, similar to the standard AR test. In fact, Lim et al. (2024) proposed a counterpart of the K test in the setting of many weak instruments with heteroskedastic errors (but it may be invalid under fixed K). Furthermore, both the K test and its many-weak-IV counterpart have non-monotone power curves, and thus, no power against certain fixed alternatives, even under strong identification (e.g., see Section 3.1 of Andrews (2016) and Lemma 2.3 of Lim et al. (2024)). On the other hand, our bootstrap AR test is dimension-agnostic and does not have the non-monotone power issue.

Remark 5.4. Navjeevan (2023) proposed a dimension-robust version of the K test, which decorrelates the endogenous variable X_i and outcome error e_i conditionally on Z_i . This approach requires consistently estimating the conditional correlation $\rho(Z_i) = \mathbb{E}(X_i e_i | Z_i)$. However, when the dimension of Z_i is large, in general, $\rho(Z_i)$ cannot be consistently estimated. Instead, Navjeevan (2023) imposes a sparsity condition and estimates $\rho(Z_i)$ by an ℓ_1 -regularized regression. Unlike Navjeevan's (2023) procedure, our test achieves robustness against the dimension of IVs without imposing any additional structure. Furthermore, if one is comfortable with imposing the sparsity assumption on $\rho(Z_i)$, then it is possible to combine our test and Navjeevan (2023)'s K test (e.g., by constructing a dimension-robust version of the conditional linear combination test in Lim et al. (2024), which is efficient under strong identification and also solves the non-monotone power issue).

6 Simulations Results

This section investigates the finite sample size and power performance of existing tests and our proposed test under two different data-generating processes (DGPs). To begin, we explicitly define these tests and their corresponding critical values. In addition, following [Belloni et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Dovì et al. \(2024\)](#), upon obtaining a given instrument set Z , we standardize it by

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ij}^2 = 1, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, K.$$

Note that the tests described in section 6.1 below are based on the “new” standardized Z .

6.1 Description of Tests

Specifically, we consider the following seven tests:

- (1) BS: Our dimension-agnostic AR test based on (2.3) and (2.6), which rejects H_0 whenever

$$\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) > \widehat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0),$$

and we let the upper bound defined in (2.5) be $\bar{\theta} \equiv \|Z^\top Z\|_{op}$;

- (2) JAR_{std}: The jackknife AR test based on [Crudu et al. \(2021\)](#)’s standard variance estimator for diverging K , which rejects H_0 whenever

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Phi}^{std}(\beta_0)}\sqrt{K}} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{ij} e_i(\beta_0) e_j(\beta_0) > q_{1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(0, 1)),$$

where $\widehat{\Phi}^{std}(\beta_0) := \frac{2}{K} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \neq i} P_{ij}^2 e_i^2(\beta_0) e_j^2(\beta_0)$ and P_{ij} denotes the (i, j) element of $P := Z(Z^\top Z)^{-1} Z^\top$;⁶

- (3) JAR_{cf}: [Mikusheva and Sun \(2022\)](#)’s jackknife AR test, which is based on a cross-fit variance estimator for diverging K and rejects H_0 whenever

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Phi}^{cf}(\beta_0)}\sqrt{K}} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{ij} e_i(\beta_0) e_j(\beta_0) > q_{1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(0, 1)),$$

where $\widehat{\Phi}^{cf}(\beta_0) := \frac{2}{K} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{P_{ij}^2}{M_{ii} M_{jj} + M_{ij}^2} [e_i(\beta_0) M_i e(\beta_0)] [e_j(\beta_0) M_j e(\beta_0)]$, $M = I_n - P$, and

⁶Note that this statistic is slightly different from the one proposed by [Crudu et al. \(2021\)](#), in that they replace P_{ij} by C_{ij} , where C is defined in Section 3.2 of their paper.

M_i denotes the i th row of M ;⁷

- (4) AR: The classical heteroskedasticity-robust AR test for fixed K , which rejects H_0 whenever

$$J_n^\top \widehat{\Omega}_n^{-1} J_n > q_{1-\alpha}(\chi_K^2),$$

where $J_n := n^{-1/2} Z^\top e(\beta_0)$ and $\widehat{\Omega}_n := n^{-1} Z^\top \{\text{diag}(e_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, e_n^2(\beta_0))\} Z$;

- (5) RJAR: The ridge-regularized jackknife AR test proposed by [Dovì et al. \(2024\)](#), which rejects H_0 whenever

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Phi}_{\gamma_n^*}(\beta_0)} \sqrt{r_n}} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\gamma_n^*, ij} e_i(\beta_0) e_j(\beta_0) > q_{1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}(0, 1)),$$

where $P_{\gamma_n^*, ij}$ denotes the (i, j) element of the matrix $P_{\gamma_n^*} := Z(Z^\top Z + \gamma_n^* I_K) Z^\top$, $r_n := \text{rank}(Z)$, $\widehat{\Phi}_{\gamma_n^*}(\beta_0) := \frac{2}{r_n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \neq i} (P_{\gamma_n^*, ij})^2 e_i^2(\beta_0) e_j^2(\beta_0)$,

$$\gamma_n^* := \max_{\theta \in \Gamma_n} \arg \max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \neq i} P_{\theta, ij}^2; \quad (6.1)$$

and $\Gamma_n := \{\gamma_n \in \mathbb{R} : \gamma_n \geq 0 \text{ if } r_n = K, \text{ and } \gamma_n \geq 1 \text{ if } r_n < K\}$;

- (6) BCCH: [Belloni et al. \(2012\)](#)'s sup-score test, which rejects H_0 whenever

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq K} \frac{\left| \sum_{i \in [n]} e_i(\beta_0) Z_{ij} \right|}{\sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n]} e_i^2(\beta_0) Z_{ij}^2}} > c_{BCCH} q_{1-\alpha/(2K)}(\mathcal{N}(0, 1)),$$

where we let $c_{BCCH} = 1.1$, following [Belloni et al. \(2012\)](#)'s recommendation;

- (7) CT: [Carrasco and Tchuente \(2016b\)](#)'s test, which rejects H_0 whenever

$$\frac{ne(\beta_0)^\top P_{0.05} e(\beta_0)}{e(\beta_0)^\top (I_n - P_{0.05}) e(\beta_0)} > \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha, CT}^*(\beta_0),$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha, CT}^*(\beta_0)$ denotes the bootstrap critical value discussed in Section 3 of their paper, and the choice of the fixed scalar 0.05 for the regularizer (which does not depend on n) follows that used in the simulations of [Dovì et al. \(2024\)](#). In particular, [Carrasco and Tchuente \(2016b\)](#) show that under homoskedastic errors, their test statistic converges to an infinite sum of weighted χ_1^2 distributions, and thus propose a residual-based bootstrap procedure for inference.

⁷In the simulations, the cross-fit variance estimator $\widehat{\Phi}^{cf}(\beta_0)$ can be negative at times. To ensure the JAR_{cf} test is well-defined, we set the variance estimator to be $\max\left(\widehat{\Phi}^{cf}(\beta_0), \frac{1}{\sqrt{n \log(n)}}\right)$.

For both DGPs, we set the number of Monte Carlo replications equal to 2,000 and the nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$. Furthermore, we set the number of bootstrap replications equal to 10,000.

6.2 Simulations Based on [Dovì et al. \(2024\)](#)

We consider the DGP given by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &= X_i\beta + \varepsilon_i, \\ X_i &= Z_i^\top \pi + v_i, \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in [n]$ with $n = 100$ and $\beta = 1$.⁸ We let the instruments $Z_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I_K)$ and error terms to be

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_i \\ v_i \end{bmatrix} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1.2 \\ 1.2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right).$$

Furthermore, we consider both sparse and dense settings for the first stage. Specifically, we set the first-stage coefficient $\pi = \zeta\kappa$, where κ is a vector of ones and zeros that varies according to the sparse or dense setting, and ζ is a scalar ensuring that for a given concentration parameter μ^2 , which captures the overall identification strength, the following relationship is satisfied:

$$\mu^2 = n\pi^\top \pi.$$

For the DGP with a sparse first stage, we set $\kappa = [1_5^\top, 0_{K-5}^\top]^\top$; for the DGP with a dense first stage, we set $\kappa = [1_{0.4K}^\top, 0_{0.6K}^\top]^\top$. We consider $K = \{1, 5, 10, 30, 90, 190\}$ and $\mu^2 = \{30, 180\}$.⁹

Size Properties: Table 1 reports the null rejection probabilities ($\beta_0 = \beta = 1$) of the seven tests across varying numbers of instruments. Note that the size results are the same irrespective of the sparse or dense setting for the first stage. We make several observations below. First, the classical AR and BCCH tests become very conservative as the number of instruments increases (e.g., $K = 30, 90$, and 190). Second, the size distortion of JAR_{cf} tends to increase with K (e.g., $K = 30$ and 90). Third, under the settings with a small number of instruments, the null rejection probabilities of the BS, RJAR (JAR_{std}), and JAR_{cf} tests are 5.7%, 7.4%, and 7.85%, respectively, for $K = 1$, and 6.4%, 7.8%, and 9%, respectively, for $K = 5$. Such a size improvement of the BS test under a small K is in line with the theoretical result in Section 4 with regard to the dimensional robustness of our bootstrap test. Fourth, under the current DGP with homoskedastic errors, the CT test has very good size control across different numbers of instruments. However, as observed in Section 6.3, it can have size distortions with heteroskedastic errors.

⁸Note that after generating the data, we first partial out the constant $W = (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

⁹Note that for $K = 1$, we set $\kappa = 1$ so that the sparse and dense DGPs are the same.

Power Properties: The power results are shown in Figures 1-3, which covers the cases with 5, 90, and 190 IVs. The power curves for other numbers of IVs are reported in Appendix I. Several remarks are in order. First, we generally see that the RJAR and BS tests have good power performance across sparse and dense settings, and across varying numbers of instruments. Second, the BCCH test typically has better power under the sparse setting than the dense one. Third, the classical AR test has good power when the number of instruments is small (e.g., $K = 5$), but it becomes much less powerful than the other tests as K increases. Fourth, in the cases with a large number of instruments (e.g., $K = 90$), the JAR_{std} , JAR_{cf} , and CT tests tend to have relatively low power, compared with the BS and RJAR tests. Simulations in Section 6.3 show that the power improvement of our BS test becomes even more evident when the DGP has a more heteroskedastic structure.

Regularizers: We further report in Table 2 the average values of the regularizers for RJAR (γ_n^*) and BS (λ) defined in (6.1) and (2.5), respectively, for varying numbers of instruments.

Table 1: **Null Rejection Probabilities**

	RJAR (5%)	JAR_{std} (5%)	JAR_{cf} (5%)	AR (5%)	BS (5%)	BCCH (5%)	CT (5%)
$K = 1$	0.074	0.074	0.079	0.053	0.057	0.031	0.054
$K = 5$	0.078	0.078	0.090	0.045	0.064	0.015	0.058
$K = 10$	0.067	0.067	0.083	0.031	0.052	0.010	0.052
$K = 30$	0.063	0.063	0.093	0.009	0.055	0.006	0.057
$K = 90$	0.039	0.018	0.199	0.000	0.058	0.000	0.053
$K = 190$	0.045	–	–	–	0.052	0.000	0.050

Note: We set the nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 2: **Average Values of the Regularizers**

	γ_n^*	λ
$K = 1$	0	92.2
$K = 5$	0	128.878
$K = 10$	0	152.996
$K = 30$	0	219.544
$K = 90$	11.899	358.829
$K = 190$	105.493	544.167

Note: We report the average values of the regularizers for RJAR (γ_n^*) and BS (λ), respectively, over 2,000 Monte Carlo replications.




Figure 1: Power curves for 5 IVs

Note: The orange curve with a hollow circle represents RJAR; the red curve with a triangle represents JAR_{std} ; the purple curve with a cross represents JAR_{cf} ; the green curve with X represents AR; the blue curve with diamond represents BS; the brown curve with inverted triangle represents BCCH; the cyan curve with a filled square represents CT. The horizontal dotted black lines represent the 5% and 10% levels.




Figure 2: Power curves for 90 IVs

Note: The orange curve with a hollow circle represents RJAR; the red curve with a triangle represents JAR_{std}; the purple curve with a cross represents JAR_{cf}; the green curve with X represents AR; the blue curve with diamond represents BS; the brown curve with inverted triangle represents BCCH; the cyan curve with a filled square represents CT. The horizontal dotted black lines represent the 5% and 10% levels.




Figure 3: Power curves for 190 IVs

Note: The orange curve with a hollow circle represents RJAR; the blue curve with diamond represents BS; the brown curve with inverted triangle represents BCCH; the cyan curve with a filled square represents CT. The horizontal dotted black lines represent the 5% and 10% levels.

6.3 Simulations Based on Hausman, Newey, Woutersen, Chao, and Swanson (2012)

We consider the following model based on the DGP given by Hausman et al. (2012), with a sample size $n = 200$ and a heteroskedastic error structure. We vary the number of instruments $K \in \{1, 10, 40, 160, 300\}$ to investigate the size and power properties of the seven tests under both fixed and diverging K settings. Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y &= X\beta + W\underset{\mp}{\leq} + D_{z_1}e, \quad \beta = 0, \quad \underset{\mp}{\leq} = 1, \\
 X &= Z\pi + U_2, \\
 W &= (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \text{where} \\
 e_i &= \rho U_{2i} + \sqrt{\frac{1 - \rho^2}{\phi^2 + 0.86^4}} (\phi v_{1i} + 0.86v_{2i}), \\
 z_{i1} &\sim \mathcal{N}(0.5, 1), \quad v_{1i} \sim z_{i1}(\text{Beta}(0.5, 0.5) - 0.5), \quad v_{2i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.86^2), \\
 D_{z_1} &= \text{diag} \left(\sqrt{1 + z_{11}^2}, \sqrt{1 + z_{21}^2}, \dots, \sqrt{1 + z_{n1}^2} \right), \\
 U_{2i} &\sim \text{exponential}(0.2) - 5, \quad \phi = 0.3, \quad \text{and} \quad \rho = 0.3.
 \end{aligned}$$

We assume that the errors are independent across i . The diagonal matrix D_{z_1} allows the error term e to be dependent on z_1 but at the same time has variance bounded away from zero, in the event some elements of z_1 are close to zero.

The i th instrument observation for $K \geq 10$ is given by

$$Z_i^\top := (z_{i1}, z_{i1}^2, z_{i1}^3, z_{i1}^4, z_{i1}^5, z_{i1}D_{i1}, \dots, z_{i1}D_{i,K-5}),$$

where $D_{ik} \in \{0, 1\}$ is a dummy variable that is independent across (i, k) with $\mathbb{P}(D_{ik} = 1) = 1/2$, so that $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Furthermore, for the case with $K = 1$, we let

$$Z_i := z_{i1}D_{i1}.$$

As in the DGP based on Dovì et al. (2024), we define

$$\mu^2 := n\pi^\top \pi,$$

and consider $\mu^2 = 72$ for $K = 1$, while $\mu^2 = 8$ for $K \geq 10$, following Hausman et al. (2012).¹⁰ We provide a discussion of the size and power results below.

¹⁰Specifically, for $K = 1$, we let $\pi = \frac{0.6}{\sqrt{K}}\iota_K$; for $K \geq 10$ we let $\pi = \frac{0.2}{\sqrt{K}}\iota_K$. We allow μ^2 to be larger for $K = 1$ to demonstrate a non-negligible power; otherwise, all the tests would have a trivial power.

Table 3: Null Rejection Probabilities

	RJAR (5%)	JAR _{std} (5%)	JAR _{cf} (5%)	AR (5%)	BS (5%)	BCCH (5%)	CT (5%)
$K = 1$	0.085	0.085	0.097	0.049	0.064	0.032	0.058
$K = 10$	0.067	0.067	0.100	0.033	0.065	0.008	0.031
$K = 40$	0.058	0.058	0.097	0.010	0.059	0.006	0.015
$K = 160$	0.072	0.072	0.198	0.000	0.062	0.002	0.002
$K = 300$	0.067	–	–	–	0.060	0.002	0.004

Note: We set the nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$.

Size Properties: Table 3 reports the null rejection probabilities ($\beta_0 = \beta = 0$) of the seven tests across varying numbers of instruments. We make several observations below. First, the RJAR, JAR_{std}, and JAR_{cf} tests suffer from remarkable size distortions when the number of instruments is small (e.g., $K = 1$). Second, the over-rejections of the three tests also become notable when K is close to the sample size (e.g., $K = 160$). Our proposed dimension-robust BS test largely resolves these size-distortion issues, no matter when K is small or large. Third, the classical AR test for fixed K controls size for all numbers of instruments but becomes very conservative when K is large. Indeed, we will see from Figure 4 that it suffers from substantial power decline when $K \geq 10$. Similarly, we observe that the BCCH and CT tests are relatively conservative when K is large. Overall, our BS test has the best size properties among the seven tests.

Power Properties: Figure 4 reports the power curves for 10, 40, 160 and 300 IVs, respectively. The power curve for 1 IV is reported in Figure 8 of Appendix I. Three remarks are in order. First, the power curves of different tests are similar for a smaller number of instruments (e.g., $K = 1, 10$). However, for the cases with a larger K (e.g., $K = 40, 160$), the power of both classical AR and CT tests is relatively low. Second, JAR_{std} and RJAR have the same power curves for $K \in \{1, 10, 40, 160\}$, because the chosen regularizer γ_n^* based on (6.1) equals zero under the current DGP. In addition, the power of JAR_{std} and RJAR become relatively low as the number of instruments becomes large (e.g., $K = 40, 160$, and also $K = 300$ for RJAR). Third, the power curves of JAR_{cf} are similar to those of JAR_{std}, but with higher rejections under the null. Fourth, for the current DGP, the BCCH test typically has good power performance for $\beta < 0$ but its power can be relatively low for $\beta > 0$. Fifth, the power curves of the BS test are much higher than the other tests when $K = 40, 160$, and 300. Overall, our test has the best power properties among the seven tests.

Regularizers: When $K = 1$, $\lambda = \bar{\theta} = 200$, where we recall that $\bar{\theta} = \|Z^\top Z\|_{op}$. When $K = 10$, $\lambda = 256$, and $\bar{\theta} = 1233.927$. When $K = 40$, $\lambda = \bar{\theta} = 3665.477$. When $K = 160$, $\lambda = \bar{\theta} = 13790.55$.

When $K = 300$, $\lambda = \bar{\theta} = 125589.05$, while $\gamma_n^* = 41$ ($\gamma_n^* = 0$ for $K = 1, 10$, and 160 for this DGP).




Figure 4: Power curves with $\mu^2 = 8$

Note: The orange curve with a hollow circle represents RJAR; the red curve with a triangle represents JAR_{std} ; the purple curve with a cross represents JAR_{cf} ; the green curve with X represents AR; the blue curve with diamond represents BS; the brown curve with inverted triangle represents S ; the cyan curve with a filled square represents CT. The horizontal dotted black lines represent the 5% and 10% levels.

7 Empirical Application

In this section, we consider an empirical application of IV regressions with underlying specifications based on [Card \(2009\)](#), [Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. \(2020\)](#), and [Dovì et al. \(2024\)](#). Specifically, we consider a single cross-section of data in year 2000 across 124 locations (cities) by using the following model:

$$Y_{ls} = \beta_s X_{ls} + \Gamma_s^\top W_l + e_{ls},$$

where β_s is the coefficient of interest and can be interpreted as the (negative) inverse elasticity of substitution between immigrants and natives in the relevant skill group s . In addition, Y_{ls} denotes the difference between the residual log wages¹¹ for immigrant and native men in skill group $s \in \{h, c\}$ (high school or college equivalent) and location (city) $l = 1, \dots, 124$. The vector of location-level controls is denoted as W_l ; in this application we include the following controls: (1) log of city size, (2) college shares, (3) manufacturing shares in both (i) 1980 and (ii) 1990, (4) mean wage residuals for (i) all natives and (ii) all immigrants in 1980, together with (5) a constant (so that there are 9 controls available for each city, i.e., $W_l \in \mathbb{R}^9$).¹² X_{ls} denotes the log ratio of immigrant to native hours worked in skill group s of both men and women in the city l .

The ratio X_{ls} is potentially endogenous because unobserved city-specific factors may shift the relative demand for immigrant workers, leading to higher relative wages and higher relative employment shares, thereby confounding the estimation of the inverse elasticity of substitution. To overcome this issue, [Card \(2009\)](#) suggests using the ratio of the total number of immigrants from foreign country m in city l to the total number of immigrants from country m as an instrument. The rationale for such a choice is that existing immigrant enclaves are likely to attract additional immigrant labor through social and cultural channels unrelated to labor market outcomes. To define the instruments, we can exploit settlement patterns at some initial period (possibly together with the arrival rate of immigrants from specific countries in subsequent periods) to determine the inflow of immigrants in each location. Specifically, we let $N_{lm,1980}$ be the number of immigrants from country $m = 1, \dots, 38$ settling into location l in 1980 and let $N_{l,1980}$ be the total number of immigrants in location l in 1980, respectively. In addition, we let $P_{l,2000}$ denote the population size of location l in 2000, including both immigrants and natives.

To proceed, we consider four sets of potential instruments for X_{ls} . The definition of the first two sets of instruments follows from [Dovì et al. \(2024\)](#). Specifically, we let the instruments for each location l be given by $z_{l,1980} := \{z_{lm,1980}\}_{m=1}^{38} \equiv \left\{ \frac{N_{lm,1980}}{N_{l,1980}} \times \frac{1}{P_{l,2000}} \right\}_{m=1}^{38} \in \mathbb{R}^{38 \times 1}$, so that our

¹¹As discussed in [Card \(2009\)](#), residual log wages are log wages after controlling for education, age, gender, race, and ethnicity of the U.S. workforce.

¹²See Table 6 in [Card \(2009\)](#) for more details on the controls.

first set of instruments can be written as $Z_{38} := (z_{1,1980}, \dots, z_{124,1980})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{124 \times 38}$. For the second set of instruments, we let each of the 38 IVs interact with the 9 controls described above, so that $z_{l,1980} \in \mathbb{R}^{342 \times 1}$ (i.e., each $z_{lm,1980}$ is interacted with 9 controls). Then, our second set of instruments is defined as $Z_{342} \in \mathbb{R}^{124 \times 342}$. Furthermore, given that our proposed bootstrap test is dimensional-robust, we consider a case with $K = 1$ for our third and fourth sets of instruments for the high school and college skill groups, respectively. Specifically, following [Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. \(2020\)](#), we construct Bartik-type instruments, which are given by $Z_{Bartik,s} = \{B_{ls}\}_{l=1}^{124} \in \mathbb{R}^{124 \times 1}$ for $s \in \{h, c\}$, where $B_{ls} := \sum_{m=1}^{38} z_{l,1980} \times g_{ms}$ and g_{ms} is the number of immigrants from country m in skill group s arriving in US from 1990 to 2000. Note that while the Bartik IVs depend on the skill group s (i.e., $Z_{Bartik,h}$ and $Z_{Bartik,c}$), the first and second sets of instruments (i.e., Z_{38} and Z_{342}) do not depend on s .

The empirical results are given in Tables 4–6. For the Bartik instruments (i.e., $K = 1$), the result for JAR_{cf} is not reported because the cross-fit variance estimator is negative. Table 4 shows the 95% confidence intervals (CIs) with the Bartik IVs. $Z_{Bartik,h}$ and $Z_{Bartik,c}$ are applied separately to their respective skill groups. The regularizers for methods RJAR and BS are $\gamma_n^* = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$, respectively, with $q_n = 0.0773$ and $p_n = 0.2168$.¹³ In addition, the number beneath each CI represents its relative length compared to the BS CI. For $K = 1$, all CIs have similar lengths. Methods RJAR and JAR_{std} have shorter CIs, but this is because these methods may not control size when K is fixed and tend to over-reject under the null, as observed in our simulation studies. Among the CIs that are theoretically valid for small K (i.e., AR, BS, and BCCH), the BS CIs are the shortest across both skill groups.

Table 5 reports the 95% CIs for high-school and college workers, respectively, with $K = 38$; the set of instruments used for both skill groups is Z_{38} . The regularizers for methods RJAR and BS are $\gamma_n^* = 0$ and $\lambda = 13.8$, respectively, with $p_n = 0.0224$ and $q_n = 0.0898$. We find that BS has the shortest CI for college workers, while JAR_{cf} has the shortest CI for high-school workers. But based on our simulation studies, JAR_{cf} may over-reject under the null, which can result in shorter CIs. Furthermore, the BS CIs are shorter than their BCCH counterparts for both high-school and college workers.

Table 6 shows the 95% CIs with $K = 342$; the set of instruments used for both skill groups is Z_{342} . The regularizers for methods RJAR and BS are $\gamma_n^* = 5.3$ and $\lambda = 67.4$, respectively, with $p_n = 0.0161$ and $q_n = 0.0897$. For both high-school and college workers, CT rejects all null hypotheses and thus results in empty confidence intervals, potentially due to heteroskedastic errors. BS again has the shortest confidence interval for college workers, and is of similar length with RJAR for high-school workers. Finally, BCCH has relatively wide CIs compared with BS and RJAR.

¹³When $K = 1$, $q_n(\lambda)$ and $p_n(\lambda)$ are independent of λ , and we set $\lambda = 0$.

Table 4: 1 IV

High-School Workers					
RJAR	JAR _{std}	AR	BS	BCCH	CT
[-0.040, -0.012]	[-0.040, -0.012]	[-0.041, -0.010]	[-0.041, -0.011]	[-0.043, -0.009]	[-0.042, -0.01]
(0.933)	(0.933)	(1.033)	(1.000)	(1.133)	(1.066)

College Workers					
RJAR	JAR _{std}	AR	BS	BCCH	CT
[-0.094, -0.043]	[-0.094, -0.043]	[-0.097, -0.040]	[-0.096, -0.041]	[-0.1, -0.038]	[-0.098, -0.040]
(0.927)	(0.927)	(1.036)	(1.000)	(1.127)	(1.0545)

Note: 95% confidence intervals with $Z_{Bartik,h}$ and $Z_{Bartik,c}$ as the instrument for high-school and college workers, respectively.

Table 5: 38 IVs

High-School Workers						
RJAR	JAR _{std}	JAR _{cf}	AR	BS	BCCH	CT
[-0.082, -0.015]	[-0.082, -0.015]	[-0.077, -0.018]	[-0.114, 0.007]	[-0.079, -0.011]	[-0.073, -0.003]	[-0.094, -0.007]
(0.985)	(0.985)	(0.868)	(1.779)	(1.000)	(1.029)	(1.279)

College Workers						
RJAR	JAR _{std}	JAR _{cf}	AR	BS	BCCH	CT
[-0.12, 0.01]	[-0.12, 0.01]	[-0.12, 0.007]	[-0.12, 0.028]	[-0.12, -0.02]	[-0.12, -0.015]	[-0.12, 0.019]
(1.30)	(1.30)	(1.27)	(1.48)	(1.00)	(1.05)	(1.39)

Note: 95% confidence intervals with Z_{38} as instruments.

Table 6: 342 IVs

High-School Workers			
RJAR	BS	BCCH	CT
[-0.077, -0.008]	[-0.079, -0.009]	[-0.083, 0.004]	\emptyset
(0.986)	(1.000)	(1.243)	(\emptyset)

College Workers			
RJAR	BS	BCCH	CT
[-0.111, 0.009]	[-0.12, -0.009]	[-0.12, -0.003]	\emptyset
(1.081)	(1.000)	(1.054)	(\emptyset)

Note: 95% confidence intervals with Z_{342} as instruments.

References

- Agan, A., J. L. Doleac, and A. Harvey (2023). Misdemeanor prosecution. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138(3), 1453–1505.
- Anatolyev, S. and N. Gospodinov (2011). Specification testing in models with many instruments. *Econometric Theory* 27(2), 427–441.

- Anatolyev, S. and M. Solvsten (2023). Testing many restrictions under heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* 236(1), 105473.
- Andrews, D. W. (2017). Identification-robust subvector inference. Technical report, Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper 2105.
- Andrews, D. W. and X. Cheng (2012). Estimation and inference with weak, semi-strong, and strong identification. *Econometrica* 80(5), 2153–2211.
- Andrews, D. W. and P. Guggenberger (2019). Identification-and singularity-robust inference for moment condition models. *Quantitative Economics* 10(4), 1703–1746.
- Andrews, D. W. K. (2002). High-order improvement of a computationally attractive k-step bootstrap for extremum estimators. *Econometrica* 70(1), 119–162.
- Andrews, D. W. K. and J. H. Stock (2007). Testing with many weak instruments. *Journal of Econometrics* 138(1), 24–46.
- Andrews, I. (2016). Conditional linear combination tests for weakly identified models. *Econometrica* 84(6), 2155–2182.
- Andrews, I. (2018). Valid two-step identification-robust confidence sets for GMM. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 100(2), 337–348.
- Andrews, I. and A. Mikusheva (2016). Conditional inference with a functional nuisance parameter. *Econometrica* 84(4), 1571–1612.
- Andrews, I., J. H. Stock, and L. Sun (2019). Weak instruments in instrumental variables regression: Theory and practice. *Annual Review of Economics* 11(1), 727–753.
- Angrist, J. D. and A. B. Krueger (1991). Does compulsory school attendance affect schooling and earning? *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106(4), 979–1014.
- Belloni, A., D. Chen, V. Chernozhukov, and C. Hansen (2012). Sparse models and methods for optimal instruments with an application to eminent domain. *Econometrica* 80(6), 2369–2429.
- Bhatia, R. (2013). *Matrix analysis*, Volume 169. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Blandhol, C., J. Bonney, M. Mogstad, and A. Torgovitsky (2022). When is tsls actually late? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research Cambridge, MA.
- Bondy, M., S. Roth, and L. Sager (2020). Crime is in the air: The contemporaneous relationship between air pollution and crime. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 7(3), 555–585.
- Boot, T. and J. W. Ligtenberg (2023). Identification- and many instrument-robust inference via invariant moment conditions. *arXiv:2303.07822*.
- Boot, T. and D. Nibbering (2024). Inference on lates with covariates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12607*.
- Card, D. (2009, May). Immigration and inequality. *American Economic Review* 99(2), 1â€“21.

- Carrasco, M. (2012). A regularization approach to the many instruments problem. *Journal of Econometrics* 170(2), 383–398.
- Carrasco, M. and M. Doukali (2017). Efficient estimation using regularized jackknife iv estimator. *Annals of Economics and Statistics* (128), 109–149.
- Carrasco, M. and G. Tchuente (2015). Regularized liml for many instruments. *Journal of Econometrics* 186(2), 427–442.
- Carrasco, M. and G. Tchuente (2016a). Efficient estimation with many weak instruments using regularization techniques. *Econometric Reviews* 35(8-10), 1609–1637.
- Carrasco, M. and G. Tchuente (2016b). Regularization based anderson rubin tests for many instruments. Technical report, School of Economics Discussion Papers, University of Kent.
- Chyn, E., B. Frandsen, and E. C. Leslie (2024). Examiner and judge designs in economics: A practitioner’s guide. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Crudu, F., G. Mellace, and Z. Sándor (2021). Inference in instrumental variable models with heteroskedasticity and many instruments. *Econometric Theory* 37(2), 281–310.
- Dahl, G. B., A. R. Kostøl, and M. Mogstad (2014). Family welfare cultures. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129(4), 1711–1752.
- Davey Smith, G. and S. Ebrahim (2003). Mendelian randomization: Can genetic epidemiology contribute to understanding environmental determinants of disease? *International journal of epidemiology* 32(1), 1–22.
- Davidson, R. and J. G. MacKinnon (2008). Bootstrap inference in a linear equation estimated by instrumental variables. *The Econometrics Journal* 11(3), 443–477.
- Davidson, R. and J. G. MacKinnon (2010). Wild bootstrap tests for IV regression. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 28(1), 128–144.
- Davidson, R. and J. G. MacKinnon (2014). Bootstrap confidence sets with weak instruments. *Econometric Reviews* 33(5-6), 651–675.
- Davies, N. M., S. von Hinke Kessler Scholder, H. Farbmacher, S. Burgess, F. Windmeijer, and G. D. Smith (2015). The many weak instruments problem and mendelian randomization. *Statistics in medicine* 34(3), 454–468.
- Deryugina, T., G. Heutel, N. H. Miller, D. Molitor, and J. Reif (2019). The mortality and medical costs of air pollution: Evidence from changes in wind direction. *American Economic Review* 109(12), 4178–4219.
- Dobbie, W., J. Goldin, and C. S. Yang (2018). The effects of pretrial detention on conviction, future crime, and employment: Evidence from randomly assigned judges. *American Economic Review* 108(2), 201–40.
- Dovì, M.-S., A. B. Kock, and S. Mavroeidis (2024). A ridge-regularized jackknifed anderson-rubin test. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 1–12.

- Doyle Jr., J. J. (2007). Child protection and child outcomes: Measuring the effects of foster care. *American Economic Review* 97(5), 1583–1610.
- Dufour, J.-M. and M. Taamouti (2005). Projection-based statistical inference in linear structural models with possibly weak instruments. *Econometrica* 73(4), 1351–1365.
- Fama, E. F. and J. D. MacBeth (1973). Risk, return, and equilibrium: Empirical tests. *Journal of Political Economy* 81(3), 607–636.
- Finlay, K. and L. M. Magnusson (2019). Two applications of wild bootstrap methods to improve inference in cluster-IV models. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 34(6), 911–933.
- Frandsen, B., L. Lefgren, and E. Leslie (2023). Judging judge fixed effects. *American Economic Review* 113(1), 253–277.
- Freedman, D. A. (1975). On tail probabilities for martingales. *the Annals of Probability*, 100–118.
- Gabaix, X. and R. S. Koijen (2024). Granular instrumental variables. *Journal of Political Economy* 132(7), 000–000.
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, P., I. Sorkin, and H. Swift (2020). Bartik instruments: What, when, why, and how. *American Economic Review* 110(8), 2586–2624.
- Guggenberger, P., F. Kleibergen, and S. Mavroeidis (2019). A more powerful subvector anderson rubin test in linear instrumental variables regression. *Quantitative Economics* 10(2), 487–526.
- Guggenberger, P., F. Kleibergen, and S. Mavroeidis (2021). A powerful subvector anderson rubin test in linear instrumental variables regression with conditional heteroskedasticity. *Econometric Theory*, 1–46.
- Guggenberger, P., F. Kleibergen, S. Mavroeidis, and L. Chen (2012). On the asymptotic sizes of subset Anderson–Rubin and Lagrange multiplier tests in linear instrumental variables regression. *Econometrica* 80(6), 2649–2666.
- Hall, P. and J. L. Horowitz (1996). Bootstrap critical values for tests based on generalized-method-of-moments estimators. *Econometrica* 64(4), 891–916.
- Hansen, C. and D. Kozbur (2014). Instrumental variables estimation with many weak instruments using regularized jive. *Journal of Econometrics* 182(2), 290–308.
- Hausman, J. A., W. K. Newey, T. Woutersen, J. C. Chao, and N. R. Swanson (2012). Instrumental variable estimation with heteroskedasticity and many instruments. *Quantitative Economics* 3(2), 211–255.
- Horowitz, J. L. and V. G. Spokoiny (2001). An adaptive, rate-optimal test of a parametric mean-regression model against a nonparametric alternative. *Econometrica* 69(3), 599–631.
- Kaffo, M. and W. Wang (2017). On bootstrap validity for specification testing with many weak instruments. *Economics Letters* 157, 107–111.
- Kleibergen, F. (2002). Pivotal statistics for testing structural parameters in instrumental variables regression. *Econometrica* 70(5), 1781–1803.

- Kleibergen, F. (2005). Testing parameters in GMM without assuming that they are identified. *Econometrica* 73(4), 1103–1124.
- Kline, P., R. Saggio, and M. S¸olvsten (2020). Leave-out estimation of variance components. *Econometrica* 88(5), 1859–1898.
- Kling, J. R. (2006). Incarceration length, employment, and earnings. *American Economic Review* 96(3), 863–876.
- Koles¸ar, M., U. K. M¸uller, and S. T. Roelsgaard (2023). The fragility of sparsity. *arXiv:2311.02299*.
- Koziol, J. A. and M. D. Perlman (1978). Combining independent chi-squared tests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 73(364), 753–763.
- Lee, D. S., J. McCrary, M. J. Moreira, and J. R. Porter (2022). Valid t-ratio inference for iv. *American Economic Review* forthcoming.
- Lim, D., W. Wang, and Y. Zhang (2024). A conditional linear combination test with many weak instruments. *Journal of Econometrics* 238(2), 105602.
- Matsushita, Y. and T. Otsu (2024). A jackknife lagrange multiplier test with many weak instruments. *Econometric Theory* 40(2), 447–470.
- Maurice J. G. Bun, H. F. and R. W. Poldermans (2020). Finite sample properties of the gmm anderson-rubin test. *Econometric Reviews* 39(10), 1042–1056.
- Mikusheva, A. and L. Sun (2022). Inference with many weak instruments. *Review of Economic Studies* 89(5), 2663–2686.
- Monti, K. L. and P. K. Sen (1976). The locally optimal combination of independent test statistics. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 71(356), 903–911.
- Moreira, H. and M. J. Moreira (2019). Optimal two-sided tests for instrumental variables regression with heteroskedastic and autocorrelated errors. *Journal of Econometrics* 213(2), 398–433.
- Moreira, M. J. (2003). A conditional likelihood ratio test for structural models. *Econometrica* 71(4), 1027–1048.
- Moreira, M. J., J. Porter, and G. Suarez (2009). Bootstrap validity for the score test when instruments may be weak. *Journal of Econometrics* 149(1), 52–64.
- Navjeevan, M. (2023). An identification and dimensionality robust test for instrumental variables models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.14892*.
- Newey, W. K. and F. Windmeijer (2009). Generalized method of moments with many weak moment conditions. *Econometrica* 77(3), 687–719.
- Pollard, D. (2001). *A User’s Guide to Measure Theoretic Probability*. Cambridge University Press.
- Roodman, D., M. Ø. Nielsen, J. G. MacKinnon, and M. D. Webb (2019). Fast and wild: Bootstrap inference in stata using boottest. *The Stata Journal* 19(1), 4–60.

- Rudelson, M. and R. Vershynin (2015). Small ball probabilities for linear images of high-dimensional distributions. *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2015(19), 9594–9617.
- Sampat, B. and H. L. Williams (2019). How do patents affect follow-on innovation? evidence from the human genome. *American Economic Review* 109(1), 203–36.
- Shanken, J. (1992). On the estimation of beta-pricing models. *The Review of Financial Studies* 5(1), 1–33.
- Słoczyński, T. (2024). When should we (not) interpret linear iv estimands as late? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06695*.
- Staiger, D. and J. H. Stock (1997). Instrumental variables regression with weak instruments. *Econometrica* 65(3), 557–586.
- Stock, J. H. and J. H. Wright (2000). GMM with weak identification. *Econometrica* 68(5), 1055–1096.
- Tuvaandorj, P. (2024). Robust permutation tests in linear instrumental variables regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* (forthcoming), 1–24.
- Van der Vaart, A. and J. A. Wellner (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer, New York.
- Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, Volume 47. Cambridge university press.
- Wang, W. (2020). On the inconsistency of nonparametric bootstraps for the subvector Anderson–Rubin test. *Economics Letters*, 109157.
- Wang, W. and F. Doko Tchatoka (2018). On Bootstrap inconsistency and Bonferroni-based size-correction for the subset Anderson–Rubin test under conditional homoskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* 207(1), 188–211.
- Wang, W. and M. Kaffo (2016). Bootstrap inference for instrumental variable models with many weak instruments. *Journal of Econometrics* 192(1), 231–268.
- Wang, W. and Y. Zhang (2024). Wild bootstrap inference for instrumental variables regressions with weak and few clusters. *Journal of Econometrics* 241(1), 105727.
- Wüthrich, K. and Y. Zhu (2023). Omitted variable bias of lasso-based inference methods: A finite sample analysis. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 105(4), 982–997.
- Young, A. (2022). Consistency without inference: Instrumental variables in practical application. *European Economic Review* 147, 104112.

Appendix

Contents

A Proof of Theorem 3.1	34
B Proof of Theorem 4.1	40
C Proof of Corollary 4.1	55
D Proof of Theorem 5.1	57
E Proof of Theorem 5.2	59
F Proof of Corollary 5.1	62
G An Anti-Concentration Inequality	62
H Additional Lemmas	64
I Additional Simulation Results	66
I.1 Simulation for Section 6.2	66
I.2 Simulation for Section 6.3	69

A Proof of Theorem 3.1

Recall

$$Q(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}.$$

We further define

$$\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) := \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} \tilde{e}_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}},$$

where

$$\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_i + \Delta \tilde{v}_i + \Delta \Pi_i.$$

The proof is divided into three sub-steps. In the first step, we prove that

$$|\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| = o_P(1). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

In the second step, we prove that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y)| = o_P(1). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

In the last step, we combine (A.1) and (A.2) to derive the final result.

Step 1: Show (A.1)

Recall

$$e_i(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) - W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0),$$

where $\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_i + (\Pi_i + \tilde{v}_i)\Delta$ and $\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0) = \hat{\gamma}_e + \Delta \hat{\gamma}_v$. No matter we are under the null or alternative, by Lemma H.1, we have

$$\|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2 = O_P\left(n^{-1/2}\right).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} e_i(\beta_0)e_j(\beta_0) - \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)\tilde{e}_j(\beta_0) &= (\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) - W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0))(\tilde{e}_j(\beta_0) - W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)) - \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)\tilde{e}_j(\beta_0) \\ &= -\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0) - \tilde{e}_j(\beta_0)W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0) + \hat{\gamma}^\top(\beta_0)W_iW_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0), \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0) &= -\frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)) P_{\lambda, ij} W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &= \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} + \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} (W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0))^2 P_{\lambda, ii}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} + q_n^{1/2} \lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} W_i W_i^\top \right) \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^2 \\
&= O_P((q_n n)^{1/2} n^{-1/2} + q_n^{1/2}) = o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is by the fact that $\sum_{j \in [n]} P_{\lambda, ij} W_j = 0$ and the second last equality is by Lemmas H.1 and H.2, and the fact that

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0) \Delta}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right| = O_P \left(\sqrt{q_n^{1/2} \frac{\|\Pi\|_2^2 \Delta^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}} \right) = o_P(1).$$

Step 2: Show (A.2)

For a set $A_y = (-\infty, y)$, define

$$h_{n,y}(x) := \max \left(0, 1 - \frac{d(x, A_y^{3\delta_n})}{\delta_n} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad f_{n,y}(x) := \mathbb{E} h_{n,y}(x + t_n \mathcal{N}),$$

where $A_y^{3\delta_n}$ is the $3\delta_n$ -enlargement of A_y , \mathcal{N} has a standard normal distribution, $\delta_n := C_h t_n / 3$ for some $C_h > 1$, and $t_n = p_n^{1/(7-\zeta)}$ for an arbitrary constant $\zeta \in (0, 1)$. By Pollard (2001)[Theorem 10.18], $f_{n,y}(\cdot)$ is twice-continuously differentiable such that for all x, y, v ,

$$\left| f_{n,y}(x+v) - f_{n,y}(x) - v \partial f_{n,y}(x) - \frac{1}{2} v^2 \partial^2 f_{n,y}(x) \right| \leq \frac{|v|^3}{9\delta_n t_n^2}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$(1 - B(C_h)) \mathbb{1}\{x \in A_y\} \leq f_{n,y}(x) \leq B(C_h) + (1 - B(C_h)) \mathbb{1}\{x \in A_y^{3\delta_n}\}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $B(C_h) := \left(\frac{C_h^2}{\exp(C_h^2 - 1)} \right)^{1/2}$ and

$$\partial^2 f_{n,y}(x) = t_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} h_{n,y}(x + t_n \mathcal{N}) (\mathcal{N}^2 - 1). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By (A.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) &\leq (1 - B(C_h))^{-1} \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0))) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \\
&\leq (1 - B(C_h))^{-1} \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0))) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q(\beta_0))) \right| \\
&\quad + \frac{B(C_h)}{1 - B(C_h)} + \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y + 3\delta_n) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \\
&\leq (1 - B(C_h))^{-1} \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0))) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q(\beta_0))) \right| \\
&\quad + \frac{B(C_h)}{1 - B(C_h)} + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q(\beta_0) - y| \leq 3\delta_n). \quad (\text{A.6})
\end{aligned}$$

We note that although $f_{n,y}(\cdot)$ depends on y through $A_y = (-\infty, y)$, and the bound in (A.3) holds uniformly over y .

Next, we first bound $\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0))) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q(\beta_0))) \right|$. Let

$$\mathcal{G}_n(\{a_i\}_{i \in [n]}) := \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \{a_i P_{\lambda,ij} a_j\}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

and $\tilde{g}_i(\beta_0) = g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i$, where $\{g_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ are i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Then, we can rewrite $\tilde{Q}(\beta_0)$ and $Q(\beta_0)$ as $\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) = \mathcal{G}_n(\{\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)\}_{i \in [n]})$ and $Q(\beta_0) = \mathcal{G}_n(\{\tilde{g}_i(\beta_0)\}_{i \in [n]})$, respectively.

For each $k \in [n]$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k &:= \frac{\sum_{i < k} \sum_{j < k, j \neq i} \{\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda,ij} \tilde{e}_j(\beta_0)\}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} + \frac{\sum_{i > k} \sum_{j > k, j \neq i} \{\tilde{g}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda,ij} \tilde{g}_j(\beta_0)\}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2 \sum_{i < k} \sum_{j > k} \{\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda,ij} \tilde{g}_j(\beta_0)\}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ \Delta_k &:= 2\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0) \left(\frac{\sum_{i < k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right) \\ \tilde{\Delta}_k &:= 2\tilde{g}_k(\beta_0) \left(\frac{\sum_{i < k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{e}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \tilde{e}_k(\beta_0), \tilde{g}_{k+1}(\beta_0), \dots, \tilde{g}_n(\beta_0)) &= \Delta_k + \lambda_k, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{e}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \tilde{e}_{k-1}(\beta_0), \tilde{g}_k(\beta_0), \dots, \tilde{g}_n(\beta_0)) &= \tilde{\Delta}_k + \lambda_k. \end{aligned}$$

By letting \mathcal{I}_k be the σ -field generated by $\{\tilde{g}_i(\beta_0), \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)\}_{i < k} \cup \{\tilde{g}_i(\beta_0), \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)\}_{i > k}$, we have $\lambda_k \in \mathcal{I}_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\Delta_k | \mathcal{I}_k) &= \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\Delta}_k | \mathcal{I}_k), \\ \mathbb{E}(\Delta_k^2 | \mathcal{I}_k) &= \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\Delta}_k^2 | \mathcal{I}_k) = 4\tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0) \left[\frac{\sum_{i < k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\mathbb{E} \tilde{\Delta}_k \partial f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) = \mathbb{E} \Delta_k \partial f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \frac{\tilde{\Delta}_k^2}{2} \partial^2 f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) = \mathbb{E} \frac{\Delta_k^2}{2} \partial^2 f_{n,y}(\lambda_k).$$

By telescoping, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0))) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q(\beta_0))) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbb{E} [f_{n,y}(\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_k, \tilde{g}_{k+1}, \dots, \tilde{g}_n))] - \mathbb{E} [f_{n,y}(\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_{k-1}, \tilde{g}_k, \dots, \tilde{g}_n))] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in [n]} \left| \mathbb{E} [f_{n,y}(\Delta_k + \lambda_k)] - \mathbb{E} [f_{n,y}(\tilde{\Delta}_k + \lambda_k)] \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{k \in [n]} \left| \mathbb{E} [f_{n,y}(\Delta_k + \lambda_k)] - \mathbb{E} f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) - \mathbb{E} \Delta_k \partial f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) - \mathbb{E} \frac{\Delta_k^2}{2} \partial^2 f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) \right| \\
&+ \sum_{k \in [n]} \left| \mathbb{E} [f_{n,y}(\tilde{\Delta}_k + \lambda_k)] - \mathbb{E} f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Delta}_k \partial f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) - \mathbb{E} \frac{\tilde{\Delta}_k^2}{2} \partial^2 f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 + |\tilde{\Delta}_k|^3)}{9\delta_n t_n^2}, \tag{A.8}
\end{aligned}$$

where we define $\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{g}_1, \dots, \tilde{g}_n, \tilde{g}_{n+1}) \equiv \mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{g}_1, \dots, \tilde{g}_n)$ and $\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_n) \equiv \mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_n)$. As the RHS of (A.8) does not depend on y , we have

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0))) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q(\beta_0))) \right| \leq \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 + |\tilde{\Delta}_k|^3)}{9\delta_n t_n^2}. \tag{A.9}$$

Let $\check{e}_i(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_i + \tilde{v}_i \Delta$, $\check{g}_i(\beta_0) = g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0)$, and

$$\theta_{k,i} = \begin{cases} P_{\lambda,ki} \check{e}_i(\beta_0) & i < k \\ P_{\lambda,ki} \check{g}_i(\beta_0) & i > k. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) = \check{e}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i, \quad \tilde{g}_i(\beta_0) = \check{g}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i,$$

$$\Delta_k = 2\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0) \frac{\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} (\theta_{k,i} + P_{\lambda,ki} \Delta \Pi_i)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3) &\lesssim \frac{1}{K_\lambda^{3/2}} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} (\theta_{k,i} + P_{\lambda,ki} \Delta \Pi_i) \right|^3 \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{K_\lambda^{3/2}} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \theta_{k,i} \right|^3 + \frac{1}{K_\lambda^{3/2}} \left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda,ki} \Delta \Pi_i \right|^3. \tag{A.10}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\{\theta_{k,i}\}_{i \in [n], i \neq k}$ is a sequence of independent mean zero random variables. Then, by Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \theta_{k,i} \right|^3 \right) &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \theta_{k,i}^2 \right)^{3/2} \right] \\
&\leq C \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \theta_{k,i}^2 \right)^2 \right) \right]^{3/4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C \left[\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2 P_{\lambda, jk}^2 \right]^{3/4} \leq C \left[\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2 \right]^{3/2}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

This implies

$$\sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \theta_{k,i} \right|^3 \right)}{K_\lambda^{3/2}} \leq C \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\left[\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2 \right]^{3/2}}{K_\lambda^{3/2}} = O \left(p_n^{1/2} \right).$$

For the second term on the RHS of (A.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{k \in [n]} \left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ki} \Delta \Pi_i \right| / K_\lambda^{1/2} &\leq \max_{k \in [n]} \left[\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ki}^2 \right]^{1/2} K_\lambda^{-1/2} |\Delta| \|\Pi\|_2 \\ &\leq p_n^{1/2} |\Delta| \|\Pi\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ki} \Delta \Pi_i \right|^3}{K_\lambda^{3/2}} &\leq p_n^{1/2} |\Delta| \|\Pi\|_2 \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ki} \Delta \Pi_i \right|^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &= p_n^{1/2} |\Delta| \|\Pi\|_2 \frac{\Pi^\top \tilde{P}_\lambda \Pi \Delta^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &\leq \frac{p_n^{1/2}}{K_\lambda^{1/4}} \left(\frac{\|\Pi\|_2^2 \Delta^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right)^{3/2} = O(p_n^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3)}{9\delta_n t_n^2} = O \left(\frac{p_n^{1/2}}{\delta_n t_n^2} \right).$$

Similarly, we have have

$$\sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{\Delta}_k|^3)}{9\delta_n t_n^2} = O_P \left(\frac{p_n^{1/2}}{\delta_n t_n^2} \right),$$

and thus,

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0))) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q(\beta_0))) \right| = O_P \left(\frac{p_n^{1/2}}{\delta_n t_n^2} \right). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

In addition, by Lemma G.1, we have

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q(\beta_0) - y| \leq \delta_n) \leq C_\zeta \delta_n^{(1-\zeta)/2} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

for any $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ and $C_\zeta \in (0, \infty)$ that only depends on ζ and \underline{c} in Assumption 1.3.

Then, combining (A.6), (A.12), and (A.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{1 - B(C_h)} \times O_P\left(\frac{p_n^{1/2}}{\delta_n t_n^2}\right) + \frac{B(C_h)}{1 - B(C_h)} + C_\zeta \delta_n^{(1-\zeta)/2} \\ & \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{1 - B(C_h)}\right) O_P\left(p_n^{\frac{1-\zeta}{2(7-\zeta)}}\right) + \frac{B(C_h)}{1 - B(C_h)}. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $C_h \rightarrow 0$, we obtain that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \right) = o_P(1).$$

By the same argument, we can show that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left(\mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) \right) = o_P(1),$$

which further implies

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) \right| = o_P(1). \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Step 3: Concluding the Proof

For any sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y, |\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| \leq \varepsilon) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) + \mathbb{P}(|\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y + \varepsilon) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) + \mathbb{P}(|\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & \leq \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \right| + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q(\beta_0) - y| \leq \varepsilon) + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & = C_\zeta \varepsilon^{(1-\zeta)/2} + o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by Lemma G.1, (A.1), and (A.2). Similarly, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) > y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) > y) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) > y, |\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| \leq \varepsilon) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) > y) + \mathbb{P}(|\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) > y - \varepsilon) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) > y) + \mathbb{P}(|\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \right| + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q(\beta_0) - y| \leq \varepsilon) + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|\hat{Q}(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon) \\
&= C_\zeta \varepsilon^{(1-\zeta)/2} + o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) \leq C_\zeta \varepsilon^{(1-\zeta)/2} + o_P(1).$$

Combining the two results, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) \right| \leq C_\zeta \varepsilon^{(1-\zeta)/2} + o_P(1).$$

By taking $\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}}$ on the LHS of the above display and letting ε shrink to zero, we obtain the desired result that, under the null,

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y) \right| = o_P(1). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

B Proof of Theorem 4.1

Throughout this section, we rely on the following notation: $M_n = n^{1/q}$, $h_n = (p_n n^{3/q})^{1/(7-\zeta)}$, where ζ is an arbitrary constant that belongs to the interval $(0, 1)$, $\delta_n = C_h h_n / 3$ for some constant C_h that is fixed and sufficiently large, and

$$t_n = (M_n^2 h_n^{-4} p_n \log(n))^{1/2} + p_n M_n^2 h_n^{-2} \log(n).$$

By Assumption 1.5, we have

$$t_n = \left[\left(p_n n^{\frac{2-2\zeta}{3-\zeta}} \right)^{\frac{3-\zeta}{7-\zeta}} \log(n) \right]^{1/2} + \left(p_n n^{\frac{8-2\zeta}{5-\zeta}} \right)^{\frac{5-\zeta}{7-\zeta}} \log(n) = o(1).$$

The constants (c, C, C', C_1) below are independent of N but may take different values in different contexts. We also note that, in this section, we do not require the null hypothesis to hold.

We aim to bound the Kolmogorov distance between $\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0)$ and $Q^*(\beta_0)$ given data \mathcal{D} , and the definitions of $\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0)$ and $Q^*(\beta_0)$ can be found in (2.6) and (3.2), respectively. Further, define

$$\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \eta_i \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} \eta_j \tilde{e}_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ is the same as those in the definition of $\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0)$.

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)| \\
&\leq \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D})| + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)|, \quad (\text{B.2})
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $Q^*(\beta_0)$ is independent of data \mathcal{D} by construction.

Step 1: Bound $\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D})|$
 Recall

$$e_i(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) - W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0),$$

where $\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_i + (\Pi_i + \tilde{v}_i)\Delta$ and $\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0) = \hat{\gamma}_e + \Delta \hat{\gamma}_v$. No matter we are under the null or alternative, by Lemma H.1, we have

$$\|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2 = O_P(n^{-1/2}).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} e_i(\beta_0)e_j(\beta_0) - \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)\tilde{e}_j(\beta_0) &= (\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) - W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0))(\tilde{e}_j(\beta_0) - W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)) - \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)\tilde{e}_j(\beta_0) \\ &= -\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0) - \tilde{e}_j(\beta_0)W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0) + \hat{\gamma}^\top(\beta_0)W_iW_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0), \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) &= -\frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \eta_i \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} \eta_j W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \eta_i (W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)) P_{\lambda, ij} \eta_j W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

For the first term on the RHS of (B.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \eta_i \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} \eta_j W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \mid \mathcal{D} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij}^2 (W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0))^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &\leq \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2 \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &= \left[\frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2}{K_\lambda} \right] \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2 \right] (\tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0))}{K_\lambda} \right] \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \left[CL + \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2 \right] (\tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0))}{K_\lambda} \right] \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

where the constant C does not depend on n and the last inequality is by the fact that

$$\frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2}{K_\lambda} \leq \frac{C \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2}{K_\lambda} \leq C.$$

For the second term on the RHS of (B.4), we note that

$$\frac{\left[\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2 \right] (\tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0))}{K_\lambda}$$

is mean zero and independent across $i \in [n]$. In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{var} \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2 \right] (\tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0))}{K_\lambda} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{C \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \right]^2}{(K_\lambda)^2} \leq Cp_n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2 \right] (\tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0))}{K_\lambda} \right| = O_P(\sqrt{p_n}). \quad (\text{B.5})$$

For the second term on the RHS of (B.3), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{var} \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \eta_i (W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)) P_{\lambda, ij} \eta_j W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \mid \mathcal{D} \right) \\ & = \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0))^2 P_{\lambda, ij}^2 (W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0))^2}{K_\lambda} \leq CL^2 \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^4. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any sequence $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(|\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon_n \mid \mathcal{D}) \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0))^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right]}{\varepsilon_n^2} \\ & \leq \frac{2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \eta_i \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} \eta_j W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \mid \mathcal{D} \right]^2}{\varepsilon_n^2} \\ & \quad + \frac{2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \eta_i (W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)) P_{\lambda, ij} \eta_j W_j^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \mid \mathcal{D} \right]^2}{\varepsilon_n^2} \\ & \leq \frac{\left[C + \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \left[\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2 \right] (\tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0))}{K_\lambda} \right] \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^2}{\varepsilon_n^2} + \frac{C \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^4}{\varepsilon_n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y \mid \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y \mid \mathcal{D})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y, |\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)| \leq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y + \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - Q^*(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}).
\end{aligned}$$

In the same manner, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) > y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) > y | \mathcal{D}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) > y, |\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)| \leq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) > y | \mathcal{D}) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) > y - \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) > y | \mathcal{D}) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y - \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two bounds, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D})| \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) - \widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)| \geq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) + |\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y + \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y - \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D})| \\
&\leq \frac{\left[CL + \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} [\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2] (\bar{e}_i^2(\beta_0) - \bar{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0))}{K_\lambda} \right] \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^2}{\varepsilon_n^2} + \frac{C \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^4}{\varepsilon_n^2} \\
&+ |\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y + \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y - \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D})| \\
&\leq \frac{\left[CL + \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} [\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \|W_j\|_2^2] (\bar{e}_i^2(\beta_0) - \bar{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0))}{K_\lambda} \right] \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^2}{\varepsilon_n^2} + \frac{C \|\hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)\|_2^4}{\varepsilon_n^2} \\
&+ \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} 2 |\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)| + \mathbb{P}(|Q^*(\beta_0) - y| \leq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $Q^*(\beta_0)$ is defined in (3.2).

Taking $\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}}$ on both sides, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D})| \\
&\leq \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} 2 |\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)| + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q^*(\beta_0) - y| \leq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) \\
&+ O_P \left(\frac{1}{n \varepsilon_n^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By choosing, for any $\zeta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\varepsilon_n = n^{-\frac{2}{5-\zeta}}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D})| \\
& \leq \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} 2|\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)| \\
& \quad + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q^*(\beta_0) - y| \leq \varepsilon_n | \mathcal{D}) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon_n^2}\right) \\
& \leq \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} 2|\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)| + O_P(\varepsilon_n^{(1-\zeta)/2}) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{n\varepsilon_n^2}\right) \\
& \leq \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} 2|\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)| + O_P\left(n^{-\frac{1-\zeta}{5-\zeta}}\right), \tag{B.6}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by Lemma G.1 and the fact that $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$.

Step 2: Bound $\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)|$.

Recall that for a set $A_y = (-\infty, y)$, we define $g_{n,y}(x) := \max\left(0, 1 - \frac{d(x, A_y^{3\delta_n})}{\delta_n}\right)$ and $f_{n,y}(x) := \mathbb{E}g_{n,y}(x + h_n\mathcal{N})$, where $A_y^{3\delta_n}$ is the $3\delta_n$ -enlargement of A_y , \mathcal{N} has a standard normal distribution, $\delta_n := C_h h_n / 3$ for some $C_h > 1$. Here, unlike in Section A, we use $h_n = (p_n n^{3/q})^{\frac{1}{7-\zeta}}$. We note that (A.3)–(A.5) still hold.

By (A.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y) & \leq (1 - B(C_h))^{-1} \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)) | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y) \\
& \leq (1 - B(C_h))^{-1} \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)) | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q^*(\beta_0))) \right| \\
& \quad + \frac{B(C_h)}{1 - B(C_h)} + \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y + 3\delta_n) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y) \\
& \leq (1 - B(C_h))^{-1} \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)) | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q^*(\beta_0))) \right| \\
& \quad + \frac{B(C_h)}{1 - B(C_h)} + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q^*(\beta_0) - y| \leq 3\delta_n), \tag{B.7}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $Q^*(\beta_0)$ is independent of \mathcal{D} .

Next, we aim to bound $\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)) | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q^*(\beta_0))) \right|$ on the RHS of (B.7). Recall

$$\mathcal{G}_n(\{a_i\}_{i \in [n]}) := \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \{a_i P_{\lambda, ij} a_j\}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}.$$

We further define $\tilde{\eta}_i = \eta_i \tilde{e}_i(\beta_0)$ and $\tilde{g}_i = g_i \tilde{\sigma}_i(\beta_0)$, where $\tilde{e}_i(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_i + \Delta(\Pi_i + \tilde{v}_i)$, $\tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) = \mathbb{E}\tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0)$, $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of random variables with zero mean and unit variance, and $\{g_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of standard normal random variables.

Under these definitions, we can rewrite $\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)$ and $Q^*(\beta_0)$ as $\widetilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) = \mathcal{G}_n(\{\tilde{\eta}_i\}_{i \in [n]})$ and $Q^*(\beta_0) = \mathcal{G}_n(\{\tilde{g}_i\}_{i \in [n]})$, respectively.

For each $k \in [n]$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_k &:= \frac{\sum_{i < k} \sum_{j < k, j \neq i} \{\tilde{\eta}_i P_{\lambda, ij} \tilde{\eta}_j\}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} + \frac{\sum_{i > k} \sum_{j > k, j \neq i} \{\tilde{g}_i P_{\lambda, ij} \tilde{g}_j\}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &+ \frac{2 \sum_{i < k} \sum_{j > k} \{\tilde{\eta}_i P_{\lambda, ij} \tilde{g}_j\}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ \Delta_k &:= 2\tilde{\eta}_k \left(\frac{\sum_{i < k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right) \\ \tilde{\Delta}_k &:= 2\tilde{g}_k \left(\frac{\sum_{i < k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right)\end{aligned}$$

so that $\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_k, \tilde{g}_{k+1}, \dots, \tilde{g}_n) = \Delta_k + \lambda_k$ and $\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_{k-1}, \tilde{g}_k, \dots, \tilde{g}_n) = \tilde{\Delta}_k + \lambda_k$. By letting \mathcal{I}_k be the σ -field generated by $\{\tilde{g}_i, \tilde{\eta}_i\}_{i < k} \cup \{\tilde{g}_i, \tilde{\eta}_i\}_{i > k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\Delta_k | \mathcal{I}_k, \mathcal{D}) &= \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\Delta}_k | \mathcal{I}_k, \mathcal{D}) = 0, \\ \mathbb{E}(\Delta_k^2 | \mathcal{I}_k, \mathcal{D}) &= 4\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) \left[\frac{\sum_{i < k-1} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2, \\ \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\Delta}_k^2 | \mathcal{I}_k, \mathcal{D}) &= 4\tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0) \left[\frac{\sum_{i < k-1} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2.\end{aligned}$$

By telescoping, we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0)) | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q^*(\beta_0)) | \mathcal{D}) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}[f_{n,y}(\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_k, \tilde{g}_{k+1}, \dots, \tilde{g}_n)) | \mathcal{D}] - \mathbb{E}[f_{n,y}(\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_{k-1}, \tilde{g}_k, \dots, \tilde{g}_n)) | \mathcal{D}] \right|, \quad (\text{B.8})\end{aligned}$$

where we define $\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{g}_1, \dots, \tilde{g}_n, \tilde{\eta}_{n+1}) \equiv \mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{g}_1, \dots, \tilde{g}_n)$ and $\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_n) \equiv \mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_n)$.

Then, by letting $x = \lambda_k$, $v = \Delta_k$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_k$ in (A.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \left| \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_k, \tilde{g}_{k+1}, \dots, \tilde{g}_n)) | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(\mathcal{G}_n(\tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_{k-1}, \tilde{g}_k, \dots, \tilde{g}_n)) | \mathcal{D}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left(2\partial^2 f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) \left[\frac{\sum_{i < k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right) (\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 + |\tilde{\Delta}_k|^3 | \mathcal{D})}{9\delta_n h_n^2}.\end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Let $H_{k,y} = \mathbb{E} \left(\partial^2 f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) \left[\frac{\sum_{i < k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda, ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right)$ and \mathcal{E}_k be the sigma field generated

by $\tilde{e}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)$. Then, we have $H_{k,y} \in \mathcal{E}_{k-1}$ and

$$|\mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q^*(\beta_0))|\mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{E}(f_{n,y}(Q(\beta_0))|\mathcal{D})| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y}(\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right| + \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 + |\tilde{\Delta}_k|^3|\mathcal{D})}{9\delta_n h_n^2}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

In the following, we aim to bound the two terms on the RHS of the above display.

Step 2.1: Bound $\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y}(\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right|$

We note that $\{H_{k,y}(\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0))\}_{i \in [n]}$ is a martingale difference sequence (MDS) w.r.t. the filtration $\{\mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \in [n]}$. For some sufficiently large constant $C_1 > 0$, define

$$H_{k,y,\leq} = H_{k,y} 1\{\max_{i \in [k-1]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \leq C_1 M_n\},$$

$\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) 1\{\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) \leq C_1 M_n\}$, $\tilde{e}_{k,>}^2(\beta_0) = \tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)$, $\tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2 = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0))$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_{k,>}^2 = \mathbb{E}(\tilde{e}_{k,>}^2(\beta_0))$. Then, for the sequence t_n defined at the beginning of the section, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y}(\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq 4C_1^3 t_n \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq}(\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq 3C_1^3 t_n \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} (H_{k,y} - H_{k,y,\leq})(\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq}(\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} \tilde{e}_{k,>}^2(\beta_0) > 0 \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} \tilde{\sigma}_{k,>}^2(\beta_0) \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} (H_{k,y} - H_{k,y,\leq})(\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right| > 0 \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq}(\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} \tilde{\sigma}_{k,>}^2(\beta_0) \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) + 2\mathbb{P}(\max_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \geq C_1 M_n) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} (\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq t_n \right) \\
& + 1\{C \geq C_1^{q+1} t_n M_n^{q-2} h_n^2\} + \frac{Cn}{C_1^q M_n^q} \\
& = \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} (\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq t_n \right) + \frac{Cn}{C_1^q M_n^q}, \tag{B.11}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last inequality holds because if $\max_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \leq C_1 M_n$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} \tilde{e}_{k,>}^2(\beta_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \\
& \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} (H_{k,y} - H_{k,y,\leq}) (\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right| = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

the last inequality holds by (A.5),

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \leq \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in [n]} h_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\frac{\sum_{i < k-1} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right) 1\{\max_{i \in [k-1]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \leq C_1 M_n\} \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{k \in [n]} \left(\frac{\sum_{i < k-1} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0)}{K_\lambda h_n^2} \right) 1\{\max_{i \in [k-1]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \leq C_1 M_n\} \\
& \leq 2C_1 M_n h_n^{-2},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\max_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \geq C_1 M_n) & \leq \mathbb{P}(\max_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i^{2q}(\beta_0) \geq C_1^q M_n^q) \\
& \leq \frac{n \mathbb{E} \tilde{e}_i^{2q}(\beta_0)}{C_1^q M_n^q} \leq \frac{Cn}{C_1^q M_n^q},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{k,>}^2(\beta_0) = \mathbb{E} \tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) 1\{\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) > C_1 M_n\} \leq \mathbb{E} \frac{\tilde{e}_k^{2q}(\beta_0)}{(C_1 M_n)^{q-1}} \leq \frac{C}{C_1^{q-1} M_n^{q-1}},$$

and the last equality on the RHS of (B.11) holds because

$$t_n M_n^{q-2} h_n^2 \geq p_n n \log(n) \rightarrow \infty.$$

To bound the first term on the RHS of (B.11), we partition the real line \mathfrak{R} into $\{|y| \leq T_n\}$ and $\{|y| > T_n\}$, where $T_n = C_1^2 \log(n)M_n$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} (\hat{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|y| > T_n} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} (\hat{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|y| \leq T_n} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq} (\hat{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \\
& := I + II.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.12}$$

In addition, we note that when $y < -T_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^2 f_{n,y}(x)| & \leq h_n^{-2} (2 \cdot 1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \mathbb{E}g_{n,y}(x + h_n\mathcal{N})(\mathcal{N}^2 - 1)1\{|x| < T_n/2\}) \\
& \leq h_n^{-2} (2 \cdot 1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \mathbb{E}1\{x + h_n\mathcal{N} \leq y + 3\delta_n\}(\mathcal{N}^2 + 1)1\{|x| < T_n/2\}) \\
& \leq h_n^{-2} (2 \cdot 1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \mathbb{E}1\{h_n\mathcal{N} \leq -T_n/2 + 3\delta_n\}(\mathcal{N}^2 + 1)1\{|x| < T_n/2\}) \\
& \leq Ch_n^{-2} \left(1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \exp\left(-\frac{(T_n/2 - 3\delta_n)^2}{4h_n^2}\right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses the fact that $|g_{n,y}(x)| \leq 1$ and the last inequality uses the facts that $T_n/2 > 3\delta_n$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}1\{h_n\mathcal{N} \leq -T_n/2 + 3\delta_n\}(\mathcal{N}^2 + 1) \\
& = \int_{-\infty}^{(-T_n/2 + 3\delta_n)/h_n} (u^2 + 1) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp(-u^2/2) du \\
& \leq \int_{-\infty}^{(-T_n/2 + 3\delta_n)/h_n} (u^2 + 1) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp(-u^2/4) du \exp\left(-\frac{(T_n/2 - 3\delta_n)^2}{4h_n^2}\right) \\
& \leq C \exp\left(-\frac{(T_n/2 - 3\delta_n)^2}{4h_n^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, when $y > T_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\partial^2 f_{n,y}(x)| & \leq h_n^{-2} (2 \cdot 1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \mathbb{E}g_{n,y}(x + h_n\mathcal{N})(\mathcal{N}^2 - 1)1\{|x| < T_n/2\}) \\
& = h_n^{-2} (2 \cdot 1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \mathbb{E}[1 - g_{n,y}(x + h_n\mathcal{N})](\mathcal{N}^2 - 1)1\{|x| < T_n/2\}) \\
& \leq h_n^{-2} (2 \cdot 1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \mathbb{E}1\{x + h_n\mathcal{N} > y\}(\mathcal{N}^2 + 1)1\{|x| < T_n/2\}) \\
& \leq h_n^{-2} (2 \cdot 1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \mathbb{E}1\{h_n\mathcal{N} \geq T_n/2\}(\mathcal{N}^2 + 1)1\{|x| < T_n/2\}) \\
& \leq Ch_n^{-2} \left(1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \exp\left(-\frac{T_n^2}{16h_n^2}\right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}g_{n,y}(x + h_n\mathcal{N})(\mathcal{N}^2 - 1) = \mathbb{E}[1 - g_{n,y}(x + h_n\mathcal{N})](\mathcal{N}^2 - 1)$$

and

$$|1 - g_{n,y}(x + h_n\mathcal{N})| \leq 1\{x + h_n\mathcal{N} \geq y\}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\sup_{|y|>T_n} |\partial^2 f_{n,y}(x)| \leq Ch_n^{-2} \left(1\{|x| \geq T_n/2\} + \exp\left(-\frac{(T_n/2 - 3\delta_n)^2}{4h_n^2}\right) \right).$$

Denote $\mathbb{I}_{k-1} = 1\{\max_{i \in [k-1]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \leq C_1 M_n\}$ with $\mathbb{I}_0 = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{|y|>T_n} |H_{k,y,\leq}| \\ & \leq Ch_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left(1\{|\lambda_k| \geq T_n/2\} \left[\frac{\sum_{i<k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i>k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right) \mathbb{I}_{k-1} \\ & + Ch_n^{-2} \exp\left(-\frac{(T_n/2 - 3\delta_n)^2}{4h_n^2}\right) \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\frac{\sum_{i<k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i>k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right) \mathbb{I}_{k-1} \\ & \leq Ch_n^{-2} [\mathbb{P}(|\lambda_k| \geq T_n/2 \mid \mathcal{D})]^{1/3} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\frac{\sum_{i<k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i>k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right)^3 \mid \mathcal{D} \right) \right]^{2/3} \mathbb{I}_{k-1} \\ & + Ch_n^{-2} \exp\left(-\frac{(T_n/2 - 3\delta_n)^2}{4h_n^2}\right) \mathbb{E} \left(\left[\frac{\sum_{i<k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i>k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right) \mathbb{I}_{k-1} \\ & \leq \frac{CC_1 M_n (\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda,ik}^2)}{h_n^2 K_\lambda} \left\{ [\mathbb{P}(|\lambda_k| \geq T_n/2 \mid \mathcal{D})]^{1/3} + \exp\left(-\frac{(T_n/2 - 3\delta_n)^2}{4h_n^2}\right) \right\} \mathbb{I}_{k-1}, \quad (\text{B.13}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by the Hölder's inequality and the third inequality is by (B.20) proved below.

Define \tilde{P}_λ an $n \times n$ matrix so that for $i, j \in m_l$,

$$\tilde{P}_{\lambda,ij} = P_{\lambda,ij} \quad \text{if } i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{P}_{\lambda,ij} = 0 \quad \text{if } i = j.$$

In addition, let

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_k &= \text{diag}(\tilde{e}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \tilde{e}_k(\beta_0), \tilde{\sigma}_{k+1}(\beta_0), \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_n(\beta_0)), \\ v_k &= (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{k-1}, 0, g_{k+1}, \dots, g_n)^\top, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_k = \Lambda_k \tilde{P}_\lambda \Lambda_k. \end{aligned}$$

With these definitions, we have

$$\lambda_k = v_k^\top \mathcal{A}_k v_k$$

and when $\mathbb{I}_{k-1} = 1$,

$$\|\mathcal{A}_k\|_F^2 \leq C_1^2 M_n^2 \frac{\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq k} \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k, i \neq j} P_{\lambda, ij}^2}{K_\lambda} \leq C_1^2 M_n^2.$$

Then, by the Hanson-Wright inequality (Vershynin (2018, Theorem 6.2.1)) with $T_n = C_1^2 \log(n) M_n$ for some sufficiently large $C_1 > 0$, when $\mathbb{I}_{k-1} = 1$, there exists a sufficiently large constant $C' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\lambda_k| \geq T_n/2 \mid \mathcal{D}) &\leq 2 \exp \left[-c \min \left(\frac{T_n^2}{4C \|\mathcal{A}_k\|_F^2}, \frac{T_n}{2C \|\mathcal{A}_k\|_{op}} \right) \right] \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left[-c \min \left(\frac{T_n^2}{4C \|\mathcal{A}_k\|_F^2}, \frac{T_n}{2C \|\mathcal{A}_k\|_F} \right) \right] \\ &\leq 2n^{-C'}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.14}$$

This, along with (B.13) and the fact that $\exp\left(-\frac{(T_n/2-3\delta_n)^2}{4h_n^2}\right)$ decays exponentially in n , implies, there exist sufficiently large constants $C', C'' > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{|y| > T_n} |H_{k, y, \leq}| \leq \frac{C_1 M_n (\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2)}{h_n^2 K_\lambda N^{C'}} \leq \frac{C (\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2)}{K_\lambda N^{C''}},$$

and

$$\sup_{|y| > T_n} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k, y, \leq} (\tilde{e}_{k, \leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k, \leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \leq \frac{CC_1 M_n}{N^{C''}}.$$

In particular, by (B.14), the constants C' and C'' can be set as an increasing function of C_1 so that by choosing a sufficiently large C_1 , we have $\frac{CC_1 M_n}{N^{C''}} \leq C_1^2 t_n$, which implies

$$I \text{ on the RHS of (B.12)} = 0. \tag{B.15}$$

Next, we turn to term II on the RHS of (B.12). We can cover $[-T_n, T_n]$ by small intervals with center y_s and length $\ell_n = \lceil \min(h_n^3 t_n / M_n^2, \delta_n) \rceil^2$. The total number of such small intervals needed to cover $[-T_n, T_n]$ is $S_n = 2 \lceil T_n / \ell_n \rceil$, which grows in a polynomial rate in n in the sense that $S_n = O(n^C)$ for some constant $C > 0$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &II \text{ on the RHS of (B.12)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|y-y'| \leq \ell_n} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} (H_{k, y, \leq} - H_{k, y', \leq}) (\tilde{e}_{k, \leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k, \leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \\ &+ \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{s \in [S_n]} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k, y_s, \leq} (\tilde{e}_{k, \leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k, \leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n \right) \\ &:= II_1 + II_2. \end{aligned} \tag{B.16}$$

To bound II_1 on the RHS of (B.16), we first note that, for any (y_1, y_2) such that $y_1 \leq y_2 \leq y_1 + \delta_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq g_{n,y_2}(x) - g_{n,y_1}(x) &= \frac{x - (y_1 + 3\delta_n)}{\delta_n} 1\{x \in (y_1 + 3\delta_n, y_2 + 3\delta_n)\} + \frac{y_2 - y_1}{\delta_n} 1\{x \in (y_2 + 3\delta_n, y_1 + 4\delta_n)\} \\ &\quad + \frac{y_2 + 4\delta_n - x}{\delta_n} 1\{x \in (y_1 + 4\delta_n, y_2 + 4\delta_n)\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies, for $y'_1 = y_1 + 3\delta_n - x$ and $y'_2 = y_2 + 3\delta_n - x$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\partial^2 f_{n,y_1}(x) - \partial^2 f_{n,y_2}(x)| \\ &\leq h_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} |g_{n,y_2}(x + h_n \mathcal{N}) - g_{n,y_1}(x + h_n \mathcal{N})| (\mathcal{N}^2 + 1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{h_n^2 \delta_n} \mathbb{E} [(h_n \mathcal{N} - y'_1) 1\{h_n \mathcal{N} \in (y'_1, y'_2)\}] (\mathcal{N}^2 + 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h_n^2 \delta_n} \mathbb{E} [(y'_2 - y'_1) 1\{h_n \mathcal{N} \in (y'_2, y'_1 + \delta_n)\}] (\mathcal{N}^2 + 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h_n^2 \delta_n} \mathbb{E} [(y'_2 + \delta_n - h_n \mathcal{N}) 1\{h_n \mathcal{N} \in (y'_1 + \delta_n, y'_2 + \delta'_n)\}] (\mathcal{N}^2 + 1) \\ &\leq \frac{C(y_2 - y_1)}{h_n^3}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $\exp(-u^2/2)(u^2 + 1)$ is bounded. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{|y-y'|\leq \ell_n} |H_{k,y,\leq} - H_{k,y',\leq}| \\ &\leq C \sup_{|y-y'|\leq \ell_n} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \partial^2 f_{n,y}(\lambda_k) - \partial^2 f_{n,y'}(\lambda_k) \right| \left[\frac{\sum_{i<k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{\eta}_i + \sum_{i>k} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right]^2 \mid \mathcal{D} \right) \mathbb{I}_{k-1} \\ &\leq C \frac{\ell_n}{h_n^3} \left[\frac{\sum_{i<k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{c}_i^2(\beta_0) + \sum_{i>k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0)}{K_\lambda} \right] \mathbb{I}_{k-1} \\ &\leq \frac{CC_1 \ell_n M_n}{h_n^3} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2}{K_\lambda} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{|y-y'|\leq \ell_n} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} (H_{k,y,\leq} - H_{k,y',\leq}) (\tilde{c}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{CC_1 \ell_n M_n}{h_n^3} \sum_{k \in [n]} \left[\frac{\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2}{K_\lambda} |(\tilde{c}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0))| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{CC_1^2 \ell_n M_n^2}{h_n^3} \leq CC_1^2 t_n^2. \end{aligned}$$

Because $t_n \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$II_1 \text{ on the RHS of (B.16)} = 0. \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Last, we turn to II_2 on the RHS of (B.16). we note that, for any $s \in [S_n]$, $H_{k,y_s,\leq} \in \mathcal{E}_{k-1}$, and thus,

$$\{H_{k,y_s,\leq}(\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)), \mathcal{E}_k\}_{k \in [n]}$$

forms a martingale difference sequence. In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{k \in [n]} |H_{k,y_s,\leq}(\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0))| \\ & \leq \max_{k \in [n]} \left(\frac{\sum_{i < k-1} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0)}{K_\lambda h_n^2} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\max_{i \in [k-1]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \leq M_n\}} 2C_1 M_n \\ & \leq C_1^2 p_n M_n^2 h_n^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V & \equiv \sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left[(H_{k,y_s,\leq}(\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)))^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_{k-1} \right] \\ & \leq C \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y,\leq}^2 \\ & \leq C \sum_{k \in [n]} \left(\frac{\sum_{i < k-1} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0)}{K_\lambda h_n^2} \right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\max_{i \in [k-1]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \leq M_n\}} \\ & \leq C C_1^2 M_n^2 h_n^{-4} p_n, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that when $\max_{i \in [k-1]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) \leq M_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in [n]} \left(\sum_{i < k-1} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) + \sum_{i > k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) \right)^2 \\ & \leq C M_n^2 \sum_{k \in [n]} \left(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \right)^2 \\ & \leq C M_n^2 \left(\max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{k \neq i} P_{\lambda,ki}^2 \right) K_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Freedman's inequality (also known as Bernstein's inequality for the martingale difference sequence, [Freedman \(1975, Theorem 1.6\)](#)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & II_2 \text{ on the RHS of (B.16)} \\ & \leq \sum_{s \in [S_n]} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y_s,\leq}(\tilde{e}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_{k,\leq}^2(\beta_0)) \right| \geq C_1^3 t_n, V \leq C C_1^2 M_n^2 h_n^{-4} p_n \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq 2 \exp \left(\log(S_n) - \frac{C_1^6 t_n^2}{2CC_1^2 M_n^2 h_n^{-4} p_n + p_n C_1^5 M_n^2 h_n^{-2} t_n / 3} \right) \\
&\leq n^{-c}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.18}$$

for some constant $c > 0$.

Combining (B.11), (B.12), (B.15), (B.17), and (B.18), we have

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} H_{k,y} (\tilde{e}_k^2(\beta_0) - \tilde{\sigma}_k^2(\beta_0)) \right| = O_P(t_n). \tag{B.19}$$

Step 2.2: Bound on $\sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 + |\tilde{\Delta}_k|^3 | \mathcal{D})}{9\delta_n h_n^2}$

Let

$$\theta_{k,i} = \begin{cases} P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{\eta}_i & i < k \\ P_{\lambda,ki} \tilde{g}_i & i > k. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$\Delta_k = 2\tilde{\eta}_k \frac{\sum_{i \neq k} \theta_{k,i}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 | \mathcal{D}) \leq \frac{C|\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3}{K_\lambda^{3/2}} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \theta_{k,i} \right|^3 | \mathcal{D} \right).$$

Conditionally on data (\mathcal{D}) , $\{\theta_{k,i}\}_{i \in [n], i \neq k}$ is a sequence of independent mean zero random variables. By Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality, on $\{\max_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i^2 \leq C_1 M_n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \theta_{k,i} \right|^3 | \mathcal{D} \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \theta_{k,i}^2 \right)^2 | \mathcal{D} \right)^{3/4} \\
&= \left[\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq k} \mathbb{E}(\theta_{k,i}^2 \theta_{k,j}^2 | \mathcal{D}) \right]^{3/4} \\
&\leq \left[C_1^2 M_n^2 \left(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda,ik}^2 \right)^2 \right]^{3/4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.20}$$

This implies, on $\{\max_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i^2 \leq C_1 M_n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 \mid \mathcal{D}) &\leq \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{CC_1^{3/4} |\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3}{K_\lambda^{3/2}} \left[M_n^2 \left(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2 \right)^2 \right]^{3/4} \\
&\leq CC_1^{3/4} p_n^{1/2} M_n^{3/4} \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2) |\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3}{K_\lambda} \\
&\leq CC_1^{3/4} p_n^{1/2} M_n^{3/2} \left(C + \left| \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2) (|\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3 - \mathbb{E}|\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3)}{K_\lambda} \right| \right).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, because

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{var} \left(\sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2) (|\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3 - \mathbb{E}|\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3)}{K_\lambda} \right) \\
&\leq C \frac{\sum_{k \in [n]} (\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2)^2}{K_\lambda^2} \leq Cp_n,
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\left| \sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{(\sum_{i \in [n], i \neq k} P_{\lambda, ik}^2) (|\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3 - \mathbb{E}|\tilde{e}_k(\beta_0)|^3)}{K_\lambda} \right| = O_P(\sqrt{p_n}).$$

For any $\delta > 0$, by letting C_1 be sufficiently large, we have $\mathbb{P}(\max_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i^2(\beta_0) > C_1 M_n) \leq \delta$, implying that

$$\sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 \mid \mathcal{D}) = O_P(p_n^{1/2} n^{3/(2q)}).$$

Similarly, we have

$$\sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(|\tilde{\Delta}_k|^3 \mid \mathcal{D}) = O_P(p_n^{1/2} n^{3/(2q)}),$$

and thus,

$$\sum_{k \in [n]} \frac{\mathbb{E}(|\Delta_k|^3 + |\tilde{\Delta}_k|^3 \mid \mathcal{D})}{9\delta_n h_n^2} = O_P\left(\frac{p_n^{1/2} n^{3/(2q)}}{\delta_n h_n^2}\right). \tag{B.21}$$

Step 2.3: Concluding Step 2

By Lemma G.1, we have

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q^*(\beta_0) - y| \leq \delta_n) \leq C_\zeta \delta_n^{(1-\zeta)/2} \tag{B.22}$$

for any $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ and $C_\zeta \in (0, \infty)$ that only depends on ζ and \underline{c} in Assumption 1.3.

Then, combining (B.7), (B.10), (B.19), (B.21), and (B.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{1 - B(C_h)} \left[O_P(t_n) + O_P\left(\frac{p_n^{1/2} n^{3/(2q)}}{\delta_n h_n^2}\right) \right] + \frac{B(C_h)}{1 - B(C_h)} + C_\zeta \delta_n^{(1-\zeta)/2} \\ & \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{1 - B(C_h)}\right) O_P\left(t_n + \left(p_n n^{3/q}\right)^{\frac{1-\zeta}{2(7-\zeta)}}\right) + \frac{B(C_h)}{1 - B(C_h)}. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $C_h \rightarrow 0$, we obtain that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y) \leq o_P(1).$$

By the same argument, we can show that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) \leq o_P(1),$$

which further implies

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)| = o_P(1). \quad (\text{B.23})$$

Step 3: Concluding the Entire Proof

Combining (B.23) with (B.6), we have

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D})| = o_P(1). \quad (\text{B.24})$$

Then, combining (B.2) with (B.23) and (B.24), we have the desired result that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}) - \mathbb{P}(Q^*(\beta_0) \leq y)| = o_P(1).$$

C Proof of Corollary 4.1

Recall that $\hat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0) = \inf\{y \in \mathfrak{R} : 1 - \alpha \leq \hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y)\}$, where

$$\hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y) = \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}^*(\beta_0) \leq y | \mathcal{D}).$$

and $F_{\beta_0}(y) = \mathbb{P}(Q(\beta_0) \leq y)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(\beta_0) = \inf\{y \in \mathfrak{R} : 1 - \alpha \leq F_{\beta_0}(y)\}$.

Further denote

$$\eta_n = \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y) - F_{\beta_0}(y) \right|, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta'_n = \left| \mathbb{P}(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y) - F_{\beta_0}(y) \right|.$$

By Theorems 3.1 and 4.1, and the definition of $Q(\beta_0)$ and $Q^*(\beta_0)$ in (3.1)-(3.2), under the null, we have $\eta_n = o_P(1)$ and $\eta'_n = o(1)$.

Then, for any y_0 and any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $1 - \alpha \leq \hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y_0)$ and $\eta_n \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$1 - \alpha \leq \hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y_0) \leq F_{\beta_0}(y_0) + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y) - F_{\beta_0}(y)| \leq F_{\beta_0}(y_0) + \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, when $\eta_n \leq \varepsilon$, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{\alpha+\varepsilon}(\beta_0) \leq \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha}^*(\beta_0).$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \geq \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha}^*(\beta_0)\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \geq \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha}^*(\beta_0), \eta_n \leq \varepsilon\right) + \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \geq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha+\varepsilon}(\beta_0)\right) + \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(Q(\beta_0) \geq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha+\varepsilon}(\beta_0)\right) + \eta'_n + \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon) \\ &= \alpha + \varepsilon + \eta'_n + \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by Assumption 2.

Similarly, for any y_0 such that $1 - (\alpha - \varepsilon) \leq F_{\beta_0}(y_0)$, we have

$$1 - (\alpha - \varepsilon) \leq F_{\beta_0}(y_0) \leq \hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y_0) + \sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} |\hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y) - F_{\beta_0}(y)| \leq \hat{F}_{\beta_0}^*(y_0) + \eta_n,$$

which implies, when $\eta_n \leq \varepsilon$,

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha}^*(\beta_0) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha-\varepsilon}(\beta_0).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha}^*(\beta_0)\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha-\varepsilon}(\beta_0)\right) + \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(Q(\beta_0) \leq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha-\varepsilon}(\beta_0)\right) + \eta'_n + \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon) \\ &\leq 1 - (\alpha - \varepsilon) + \eta'_n + \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \geq \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha}^*(\beta_0)\right) \geq \alpha - \varepsilon - \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon) - \eta'_n.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left|\mathbb{P}\left(\hat{Q}(\beta_0) \geq \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\alpha}^*(\beta_0)\right) - \alpha\right| \leq \varepsilon + \mathbb{P}(\eta_n > \varepsilon) + \eta'_n.$$

By letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the desired result.

D Proof of Theorem 5.1

By Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y \right) - \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \leq y \right) \right| = o_P(1),$$

where $\{g_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &+ \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} 2g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) \left(\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij} \Delta \Pi_j \right)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} + \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ij} \Pi_j \Delta^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

To analyze the first term on the RHS of (D.1), we denote $\tilde{P}_\lambda = P_\lambda - \text{diag}(P_\lambda)$ and $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)$ as the eigenvalues of matrix

$$\text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0)) \tilde{P}_\lambda \text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0)).$$

Then, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i^2 \omega_i / \sqrt{K_\lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^n (g_i^2 - 1) \omega_i / \sqrt{K_\lambda},$$

where the second equality is by the fact that $\sum_{i \in [n]} \omega_i = 0$.

Let $\Psi(\beta_0) = \text{var}(\sum_{i=1}^n g_i^2 \omega_i / \sqrt{K_\lambda}) = \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \check{\sigma}_j^2(\beta_0)}{K_\lambda}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \frac{((g_i^2 - 1) \omega_i / \sqrt{K_\lambda})^4}{\Psi^2(\beta_0)} &\lesssim \frac{\max_i \omega_i^2}{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \check{\sigma}_j^2(\beta_0)} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\max_i \omega_i^2}{K_\lambda} = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which verifies the Lyapunov's condition. To see the last inequality, we note that

$$\max_i \omega_i^2 \leq \left\| \text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0)) \tilde{P}_\lambda \text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0)) \right\|_{op}^2 \leq C$$

for some constant $C < \infty$.

Therefore, by CLT, we have

$$\Psi^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

For the second term on the RHS of (D.1), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var} \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} 2g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) \left(\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij} \Delta \Pi_j \right)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right) &\lesssim \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \left(\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij} \Delta \Pi_j \right)^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\Delta^2 \Pi^\top \tilde{P}_\lambda^2 \Pi}{K_\lambda} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \frac{\|\Pi\|_2^2 \Delta^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Last, we have $\Psi(\beta_0) \geq c$ and $\Psi^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ij} \Pi_j \Delta^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \rightarrow \mu(\beta_0)$. Therefore, we have

$$\Psi^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(\mu(\beta_0), 1),$$

which, combined with Theorem 3.1, implies

$$\Psi^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \widehat{Q}(\beta_0) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(\mu(\beta_0), 1).$$

Similar to the analysis of the first term on the RHS of (D.1), we can show that

$$\tilde{\Psi}^{-1/2}(\beta_0) Q^*(\beta_0) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\beta_0) = \frac{2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (\check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) + \Delta^2 \Pi_i^2) P_{\lambda, ij}^2 (\check{\sigma}_j^2(\beta_0) + \Delta^2 \Pi_j^2)}{K_\lambda}.$$

In addition, we have $\Psi(\beta_0) \geq c$ for some constant $c > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\tilde{\Psi}(\beta_0) - \Psi(\beta_0)}{\Psi(\beta_0)} \right| &\lesssim \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \Delta^2 \Pi_i^2 P_{\lambda, ij}^2}{K_\lambda} + \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \Delta^2 \Pi_i^2 P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \Delta^2 \Pi_j^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} \Delta^2 \Pi_i^2 P_{\lambda, ij}^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \frac{\|\Pi\|_2^2 \Delta^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is by the fact that $|\Delta|$ and $|\Pi_j|$ are assumed to be bounded and the last inequality is by the fact that

$$\sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \leq P_{\lambda, ii} \leq 1.$$

This implies

$$\Psi^{-1/2}(\beta_0)\widehat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0) \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{Z}(1 - \alpha),$$

where $\mathcal{Z}(1 - \alpha)$ is the $1 - \alpha$ quantile of a standard normal random variable and

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) > \widehat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0)) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1)| > \mathcal{Z}(1 - \alpha)).$$

E Proof of Theorem 5.2

By Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) \leq y\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \leq y\right) \right| = o_P(1),$$

where $\{g_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. standard normal random variables.

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} - \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i)^2 P_{\lambda, ii}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} - \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ii}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} + o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $\check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) = \mathbb{E}(g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i)^2$ and

$$\text{var} \left(\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i)^2 P_{\lambda, ii}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right) \lesssim \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda, ii}^2}{K_\lambda} \lesssim \max_{\lambda, ii} \sum_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda, ii} \lesssim \max_{\lambda, ii} K = o(1),$$

where the last inequality holds by the fact that

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda, ii} = \text{tr}(P_\lambda) \leq \min(K, n) = K.$$

In addition, consider the singular value decomposition of Z as

$$Z = \mathcal{U} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{V}^\top,$$

where $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{U}^\top \mathcal{U} = I_n$, $\mathcal{S} = [S_0, 0_{K, n-K}]^\top$, S_0 is a diagonal matrix of non-zero singular values, $0_{K, n-K} \in \mathfrak{R}^{K \times (n-K)}$ is a matrix of zeros, $\mathcal{V} \in \mathfrak{R}^{K \times K}$, and $\mathcal{V}^\top \mathcal{V} = I_K$. Further denote $\mathcal{U} = [\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2]$ such that $\mathcal{U}_1 \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times K}$, $\mathcal{U}_2 \in \mathfrak{R}^{n \times (n-K)}$, $\mathcal{U}_1^\top \mathcal{U}_1 = I_K$, $\mathcal{U}_1^\top \mathcal{U}_2 = 0_{K, n-K}$, and $\mathcal{U}_2^\top \mathcal{U}_2 = I_{n-K}$.

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_\lambda &= \mathcal{U} \mathcal{S} \mathcal{V}^\top (\mathcal{V} (\mathcal{S}^\top \mathcal{S} + \lambda I_K) \mathcal{V}^\top)^{-1} \mathcal{V} \mathcal{S}^\top \mathcal{U}^\top \\ &= \mathcal{U} \mathcal{S} (\mathcal{S}_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} \mathcal{S}^\top \mathcal{U}^\top \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathcal{U} \begin{pmatrix} S_0(S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 & 0_{K, n-K} \\ 0_{n-K, K} & 0_{n-K, n-K} \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{U}^\top \\
&= \mathcal{U}_1 S_0 (S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 \mathcal{U}_1^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $\bar{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)^\top$,

$$\Omega(\beta_0) = \mathcal{U}_1^\top \text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n^2(\beta_0)) \mathcal{U}_1,$$

and

$$\tilde{\nu}(\beta_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Omega^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \Delta \mathcal{U}_1^\top \Pi.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_1^\top \begin{pmatrix} g_1 \check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_n \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_n \end{pmatrix} &= \mathcal{U}_1^\top (\Delta \Pi + \text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0)) \bar{g}) \\
&= \Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0) (\tilde{\nu}(\beta_0) + \tilde{\mathcal{G}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \Omega^{-1/2}(\beta_0) \mathcal{U}_1^\top \text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0)) \bar{g}$$

and $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ follows a K -dimensional standard normal distribution.

Further, consider the eigenvalue decomposition

$$A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0) S_0 (S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 \Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0))}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} = \mathbb{U} \text{diag}(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K) \mathbb{U}^\top,$$

where $\mathbb{U} \in \mathfrak{R}^{K \times K}$, $\mathbb{U}^\top \mathbb{U} = I_K$, $\{\omega_k\}_{k \in [K]}$ are K non-negative eigenvalues. Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathbb{U}^\top \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, $\nu(\beta_0) = \mathbb{U}^\top \tilde{\nu}(\beta_0)$, $\nu_k(\beta_0)$ be the k -th element of $\nu(\beta_0)$, and \mathcal{G}_k be the k -th element of \mathcal{G} so that they are i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \begin{pmatrix} g_1 \check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_n \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_n \end{pmatrix}^\top \mathcal{U}_1 S_0 (S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 \mathcal{U}_1^\top \begin{pmatrix} g_1 \check{\sigma}_1(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_n \check{\sigma}_n(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_n \end{pmatrix} \\
&= (\tilde{\nu}(\beta_0) + \tilde{\mathcal{G}})^\top \frac{(\Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0) S_0 (S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 \Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0))}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} (\tilde{\nu}(\beta_0) + \tilde{\mathcal{G}}) \\
&\stackrel{p}{\rightarrow} (\tilde{\nu}(\beta_0) + \tilde{\mathcal{G}})^\top \mathbb{U} \text{diag}(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K) \mathbb{U}^\top (\tilde{\nu}(\beta_0) + \tilde{\mathcal{G}}) \\
&= \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k (\nu_k(\beta_0) + \mathcal{G}_k)^2 \\
&= \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0)),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0)) = (\nu_k(\beta_0) + \mathcal{G}_k)^2$ is a sequence of independent chi-squared random variable with one degree of freedom and noncentrality parameter $\nu_k^2(\beta_0)$.

Similarly, we have

$$Q^*(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} g_i \tilde{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} g_j \tilde{\sigma}_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} - \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ii}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} + o_P(1)$$

and

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} g_i \tilde{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) P_{\lambda, ij} g_j \tilde{\sigma}_j(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \rightsquigarrow \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k^* \chi_k^2,$$

where $\{\chi_k^2\}_{k \in [K]}$ are K i.i.d. chi-squared random variable with one degree of freedom and $(\omega_1^*, \dots, \omega_K^*)$ are the eigenvalues (in descending order) of

$$A^* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left(\tilde{\Omega}^{1/2}(\beta_0) S_0 (S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 \tilde{\Omega}^{1/2}(\beta_0) \right)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}},$$

where

$$\tilde{\Omega}(\beta_0) = \mathcal{U}_1^\top \text{diag}(\tilde{\sigma}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_n^2(\beta_0)) \mathcal{U}_1,$$

In addition, we have $A = A^*$, and thus, $\omega_k = \omega_k^*$ for $k \in [K]$, because

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{\left(\Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0) S_0 (S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 \Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0) \right)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} - \frac{\left(\tilde{\Omega}^{1/2}(\beta_0) S_0 (S_0^2 + \lambda I_K)^{-1} S_0 \tilde{\Omega}^{1/2}(\beta_0) \right)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right\|_{op} \\ & \lesssim \frac{\left\| \tilde{\Omega}^{1/2}(\beta_0) - \Omega^{1/2}(\beta_0) \right\|_{op}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ & \lesssim \frac{\left\| \tilde{\Omega}(\beta_0) - \Omega(\beta_0) \right\|_{op}}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \\ & \lesssim \left\| \frac{1}{n \sqrt{K_\lambda}} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{U}_{1, i} \mathcal{U}_{1, i}^\top \Pi_i^2 \Delta^2 \right\|_{op} \\ & \lesssim \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathcal{U}_{1, i}\|_2^2}{n} \frac{\Pi^\top \Pi \Delta^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality is by the fact that $\|A^{1/2} - B^{1/2}\|_S \leq \|A - B\|_S^{1/2}$ for symmetric and positive semidefinite matrices A and B (see [Bhatia \(2013, Theorem X.1.1\)](#) with $f(u) = u^{1/2}$), and the last equality is by the fact that $\Pi^\top \Pi \Delta^2 / \sqrt{K_\lambda} = O(1)$ and $\max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathcal{U}_{1, i}\|_2 = o(\sqrt{n})$. This implies

$$\sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k^* \chi_k^2 \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Q}(\beta_0) > \widehat{C}_\alpha^*(\beta_0)) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0)) > \mathcal{C}(1 - \alpha)\right),$$

where $\mathcal{C}(1 - \alpha)$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of $\sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2$.

F Proof of Corollary 5.1

We have

$$\left(\phi^*(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_K^2(\beta_0)), \phi_0\right) \rightsquigarrow \left(\phi^*(\chi_1^2(\nu_1^2(\beta_0)), \dots, \chi_K^2(\nu_K^2(\beta_0))), 1\left\{\sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0)) > \mathcal{C}_\omega(1 - \alpha)\right\}\right).$$

Given that both $\phi^*(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_K^2(\beta_0))$ and ϕ_0 are bounded, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathbb{E}\phi^*(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_K^2(\beta_0)), \mathbb{E}\phi_0\right) \\ & \rightarrow \left(\mathbb{E}\phi^*(\chi_1^2(\nu_1^2(\beta_0)), \dots, \chi_K^2(\nu_K^2(\beta_0))), \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0)) > \mathcal{C}_\omega(1 - \alpha)\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we note that the acceptance region of test $1\{\sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \chi_k^2(\nu_k^2(\beta_0)) > \mathcal{C}_\omega(1 - \alpha)\}$ is $\mathbb{A} = \{\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_K : \sum_{k \in [K]} \omega_k \mathcal{X}_k^2 \leq \mathcal{C}_\omega(1 - \alpha)\}$, which is closed, convex, and monotone decreasing in the sense that if $(\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_K) \in \mathbb{A}$ and $0 \leq \mathcal{X}'_1 \leq \mathcal{X}_1, \dots, 0 \leq \mathcal{X}'_K \leq \mathcal{X}_K$, then $(\mathcal{X}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}'_K) \in \mathbb{A}$. Then, the desired result follows [Andrews \(2016, Theorem 1\)](#), which is a direct consequence of results in [Monti and Sen \(1976\)](#) and [Kozioł and Perlman \(1978\)](#).

G An Anti-Concentration Inequality

Lemma G.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Then, for any $t > 0$ and any $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $C_\zeta > 0$ that only depends on \underline{c} in Assumption 1.3 and ζ such that*

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q(\beta_0) - y| \leq t) \leq C_\zeta t^{(1-\zeta)/2}$$

and

$$\sup_{y \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q^*(\beta_0) - y| \leq t) \leq C_\zeta t^{(1-\zeta)/2}.$$

Proof. Recall

$$Q(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_i) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \check{\sigma}_j(\beta_0) + \Delta \Pi_j)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}},$$

where $\{g_i\}_{i \in [n]}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. standard normal random variables.

Further define $\mathbb{A} = \Lambda(\beta_0)^{1/2} \tilde{P}_\lambda \Lambda(\beta_0)^{1/2} / \sqrt{K_\lambda}$, where $\Lambda(\beta_0) = \text{diag}(\check{\sigma}_1^2(\beta_0), \dots, \check{\sigma}_n^2(\beta_0))$ and \tilde{P}_λ is a $n \times n$ matrix so that

$$\tilde{P}_{\lambda,ij} = P_{\lambda,ij} \quad \text{if } i \neq j \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{P}_{\lambda,ij} = 0 \quad \text{if } i = j.$$

Then, we have

$$Q(\beta_0) = \bar{g}^\top(\beta_0) \mathbb{A} \bar{g}(\beta_0) \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{i \in [n]} \omega_i \chi_i^2(\nu_i^2),$$

where $\bar{g}(\beta_0) = (g_1 + \nu_1, \dots, g_n + \nu_n)^\top$, $\nu_i = \Delta \Pi_i / \check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0)$, $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ are the n eigenvalues of \mathbb{A} , and $\chi_1^2(\nu_1^2), \dots, \chi_n^2(\nu_n^2)$ are n i.i.d. chi-squared random variables with one degree of freedom and noncentrality parameters ν_i^2 . In addition, for any $z > 0$ and $t > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\chi^2(\nu^2) - z| \leq t) &= \mathbb{P}(\max(0, z - t) \leq (g + \nu)^2 \leq z + t) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{\max(0, z - t)} \leq g + \nu \leq \sqrt{z + t}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(-\sqrt{z + t} \leq g + \nu \leq -\sqrt{\max(0, z - t)}) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi^2}} (\sqrt{z + t} - \sqrt{\max(0, z - t)}) \\ &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi^2}} \frac{(z + t) - \max(0, z - t)}{\sqrt{z + t} + \sqrt{\max(0, z - t)}} \\ &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{t}}{\pi}, \end{aligned}$$

where g is a standard normal variable, the first inequality is by the fact that standard normal PDF is bounded by $1/\sqrt{2\pi^2}$ and the second inequality is by the fact that when $t, z > 0$, we have

$$(z + t) - \max(0, z - t) \leq 2t \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{z + t} + \sqrt{\max(0, z - t)} \geq \sqrt{t}.$$

Taking $\sup_{z \in \mathfrak{R}}$ on both sides, we have

$$\sup_{z \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|\chi^2(\nu^2) - z| \leq t) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{t}}{\pi},$$

which verifies the condition in [Rudelson and Vershynin \(2015, Theorem 1.5\)](#). Then, by [Rudelson and Vershynin \(2015, Theorem 1.5\)](#) with their A, X, p, t being $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n), (\chi_1^2(\nu_1^2), \dots, \chi_n^2(\nu_n^2)), \frac{2\sqrt{2}\sqrt{t}}{\pi}$, and t , respectively. Then, for any $t > 0$ and $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{z \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q(\beta_0) - z| \leq t \|\mathbb{A}\|_F) \\ &= \sup_{z \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \omega_i \chi_i^2(\nu_i^2) - z \right| \leq t \|\mathbb{A}\|_F\right) \leq C_\zeta t^{(1-\zeta)/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $r(A) = 1$ in [Rudelson and Vershynin \(2015\)](#) and $\|A\|_{HS}$ in [Rudelson and Vershynin's \(2015\)](#) notation is just $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i^2} = \|\mathbb{A}\|_F$ in our notation. By [Assumption 1.3](#),

we have

$$\|\mathbb{A}\|_F^2 = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} P_{\lambda, ij}^2 \check{\sigma}_i^2(\beta_0) \check{\sigma}_j^2(\beta_0)}{K_\lambda} \geq \underline{c}^2 > 0.$$

Therefore, for any $t > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}(|Q(\beta_0) - z| \leq t) &= \sup_{z \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}\left(|Q(\beta_0) - z| \leq \frac{t}{\|\mathbb{A}\|_F} \|\mathbb{A}\|_F\right) \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbb{P}\left(|Q(\beta_0) - z| \leq \frac{t}{\underline{c}} \|\mathbb{A}\|_F\right) \\ &\leq C_\zeta \left(\frac{t}{\underline{c}}\right)^{(1-\zeta)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the desired result holds if we take on both sides of the above display.

For the second result, we note that

$$Q^*(\beta_0) = \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n], j \neq i} (g_i \tilde{\sigma}_i(\beta_0)) P_{\lambda, ij} (g_j \tilde{\sigma}_j(\beta_0))}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}.$$

Then, we can derive the result following the same argument above with ν_i and $\check{\sigma}_i(\beta_0)$ replaced by 0 and $\tilde{\sigma}_i(\beta_0)$. \square

H Additional Lemmas

Lemma H.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Let*

$$\hat{\gamma}_e = (W^\top W)^{-1} W^\top \tilde{e} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\gamma}_v = (W^\top W)^{-1} W^\top \tilde{v}.$$

Then, we have

$$\|\hat{\gamma}_e\|_2 = O_P(n^{-1/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\gamma}_v\|_2 = O_P(n^{-1/2}).$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} W_i \tilde{e}_i \right\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^2 \|W_i\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{n},$$

which implies

$$\|\hat{\gamma}_e\|_2 \leq \left(\lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{n} W^\top W \right) \right)^{-1} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} W_i \tilde{e}_i \right\|_2 = O_P(n^{-1/2}).$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$\|\hat{\gamma}_v\|_2 = O_P\left(n^{-1/2}\right).$$

□

Lemma H.2. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Then, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right\|_2 = O_P\left((q_n n)^{1/2}\right), \quad \left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{v}_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right\|_2 = O_P\left((q_n n)^{1/2}\right),$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0) \Delta}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right| = O_P\left(\sqrt{q_n^{1/2} \frac{\|\Pi\|_2^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}}\right).$$

Proof. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{e}_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right\|_2^2 &\lesssim \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} (P_{\lambda, ii})^2 \|W_i\|_2^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &\lesssim q_n n. \end{aligned}$$

The second result can be proved in the same manner. For the last result, we have

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}_e}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right| + \left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}_v \Delta}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right|.$$

For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}_e}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right|^2 &\lesssim \frac{\sum_{j \in [n]} (\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} P_{W, ij})^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \sum_{k \in [n]} \Pi_i \Pi_k P_{\lambda, ii} P_{\lambda, kk} P_{W, ik}}{K_\lambda} \\ &\leq \frac{\max_{i \in [n]} P_{\lambda, ii} \|\Pi\|_2^2}{K_\lambda} \\ &\leq q_n^{1/2} \frac{\|\Pi\|_2^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we define $P_{W, ij} = W_i^\top (W^\top W)^{-1} W_j$, which is just the (i, j) -entry of W 's projection matrix. Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}_v}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right|^2 \leq q_n^{1/2} \frac{\|\Pi\|_2^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}.$$

This implies

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{i \in [n]} \Pi_i P_{\lambda, ii} W_i^\top \hat{\gamma}(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}} \right| = O_P \left(\sqrt{q_n^{1/2} \frac{\|\Pi\|_2^2}{\sqrt{K_\lambda}}} \right).$$

□

I Additional Simulation Results

I.1 Simulation for Section 6.2




Figure 5: Power curves for 1 IV

Note: The orange curve with a hollow circle represents RJAR; the red curve with a triangle represents JAR_{std} ; the purple curve with a cross represents JAR_{cf} ; the green curve with X represents AR; the blue curve with diamond represents BS; the brown curve with inverted triangle represents BCCH; the cyan curve with a filled square represents CT. The horizontal dotted black lines represent the 5% and 10% levels.




Figure 6: Power curves for 10 IVs

Note: The orange curve with a hollow circle represents RJAR; the red curve with a triangle represents JAR_{std} ; the purple curve with a cross represents JAR_{cf} ; the green curve with X represents AR; the blue curve with diamond represents BS; the brown curve with inverted triangle represents BCCH; the cyan curve with a filled square represents CT. The horizontal dotted black lines represent the 5% and 10% levels.




Figure 7: Power curves for 30 IVs

Note: The orange curve with a hollow circle represents RJAR; the red curve with a triangle represents JAR_{std} ; the purple curve with a cross represents JAR_{cf} ; the green curve with X represents AR; the blue curve with diamond represents BS; the brown curve with inverted triangle represents BCCH; the cyan curve with a filled square represents CT. The horizontal dotted black lines represent the 5% and 10% levels.

I.2 Simulation for Section 6.3




Figure 8: Power curves for 1 IV, $\mu^2 = 72$

Note: The orange curve with a hollow circle represents RJAR; the red curve with a triangle represents JAR_{std} ; the purple curve with a cross represents JAR_{cf} ; the green curve with X represents AR; the blue curve with diamond represents BS; the brown curve with inverted triangle represents BCCH; the cyan curve with a filled square represents CT. The horizontal dotted black lines represent the 5% and 10% levels.