

# Unified optimal model averaging with a general loss function based on cross-validation\*

Dalei Yu<sup>a</sup>, Xinyu Zhang<sup>b</sup>, and Hua Liang<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Statistics, School of Mathematics and Statistics,  
Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China

<sup>b</sup>Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

<sup>c</sup>Department of Statistics, George Washington University, Washington, DC

## Abstract

Studying unified model averaging estimation for situations with complicated data structures, we propose a novel model averaging method based on cross-validation (MACV). MACV unifies a large class of new and existing model averaging estimators and covers a very general class of loss functions. Furthermore, to reduce the computational burden caused by the conventional leave-subject/one-out cross validation, we propose a SEcond-order-Approximated Leave-one/subject-out (SEAL) cross validation, which largely improves the computation efficiency. In the context of non-independent and non-identically distributed random variables, we establish the unified theory for analyzing the asymptotic behaviors of the proposed MACV and SEAL methods, where the number of candidate models is allowed to diverge with sample size. To demonstrate the breadth of the proposed methodology, we exemplify four optimal model averaging estimators under four important situations, i.e., longitudinal data with discrete responses, within-cluster correlation structure modeling, conditional prediction in spatial data, and quantile regression with a potential correlation structure. We conduct extensive simulation studies and analyze real-data examples to illustrate the advantages of the proposed methods.

*Keywords:* Asymptotic optimality; Consistency; Misspecification; Non-normal/non-independent data; Spatial data.

---

\*Dalei Yu and Xinyu Zhang are co-first authors. Corresponding author: Hua Liang. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 12071414, Grant 71925007, Grant 72091212, Grant 71988101, and Grant 12288201, and in part by the CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research under Grant YSBR-008.

# 1 Introduction

Having played a prominent role akin to that by model selection, model averaging has been extensively studied in the past two decades (Hansen, 2007; Wan et al., 2010; Lu and Su, 2015; Zhang et al., 2016, 2020). Model misspecification is unavoidable in practice (Lv and Liu, 2014) and in the presence of potential model misspecification, there are growing theoretical and empirical evidences showing that model averaging can provide more accurate predictions than its model selection counterparts (Lu and Su, 2015; Zhang et al., 2020; Peng and Yang, 2022). This makes model averaging a promising option.

The research concerning model averaging in linear regression models for independent observations has grown in the past two decades (Hansen, 2007; Wan et al., 2010; Liang et al., 2011; Hansen and Racine, 2012; Ando and Li, 2014; Zhang et al., 2020). In the situation where the data structure becomes more complicated, Zhang et al. (2013) investigated the behavior of jackknife model averaging in linear regression for dependent data. Zhang et al. (2016) investigated the optimal model averaging estimation in generalized linear mixed models. Liu et al. (2020a) studied the optimal model averaging in time series models. Recently, Feng et al. (2021) proposed a nonlinear information criterion for model averaging in nonlinear regression models for continuously distributed data.

Various loss functions have been adopted in different areas of data analysis (Li et al., 2019; Christoffersen and Jacobs, 2004; Bartlett et al., 2006) and various model averaging methods have been established based on different loss functions (Zhang et al., 2016; Lu and Su, 2015). In the most of existing studies regarding model averaging, under different data settings, by adopting different loss functions, models, or estimation methods, specific model averaging approaches can be developed in a case-by-case manner. Given the promising properties and popularity of model averaging, additional efforts in this direction are still in great demand. However, committing to such case-by-case studies is not only

theoretically challenging but also inconvenient.

Ideally, we hope to develop a general model averaging framework that can deal with a broad range of data structures under various loss functions and is applicable to various estimating methods. The resultant frame possesses promising asymptotic properties/optimality and computational convenience. However, developing such a unified model averaging method for a general class of loss functions is not a straightforward extension of existing results. For instance, the situation of longitudinal data with discrete responses and non-normal spatial data, the full likelihood of the data is either too complicated to be explicitly tractable or unavailable. As a result, we do not have any immediate estimator for the risk function. This raises difficulties in developing weight choice criteria and the corresponding asymptotic properties for model averaging estimators. This article aims to establish the unified optimal model averaging and its theory. We immediately face the following three challenges.

- (a) *Since we focus on general loss functions and do not make any specific distributional assumptions in the development of unified model averaging, there is no immediate estimator for the risk function when the candidate models are misspecified.*
- (b) *In the typical context of non-normal and correlated data, responses connect the linear predictors via nonlinear functions in a complicated manner. Thus, the risk function cannot be expressed in a usual form, such as a linear-quadratic-type expression of the weight vector, and the theoretical instrument for analyzing the properties under such a general form of risk functions remains unknown, especially when there is a divergent number of candidate models.*
- (c) *Cross-validation (CV) is usually adopted to develop flexible model selection or averaging instruments. However, conventional leave-one-out based CV is typically computationally burdensome and this poses challenges to the development of computationally*

*efficient model averaging.*

In this article, we make efforts to develop a general model averaging framework and contribute in three folds.

- (i) *We establish the asymptotic theory for the proposed model averaging estimator under two scenarios: (1) all the candidate models are misspecified in the exact sense (the notion of exact sense is given in Definition 1), and (2) at least one of them is correctly specified in the exact sense. These results are then extended to the situation with a divergent number of candidate models.*
- (ii) *We further propose a second-order-approximated leave-one/subject-out (SEAL) method which significantly reduces the computing time and is asymptotically equivalent to the conventional CV.*
- (iii) *We exemplify four novel optimal model averaging estimators in the context of longitudinal data with discrete responses, modeling the within-cluster correlation, conditional prediction in spatial data, and quantile regression in the presence of a potential correlation structure, which have not been investigated in the model averaging literature.*

The remaining part of the paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 proposes the unified setup of the model averaging based on CV and within this framework, three new optimal model averaging estimators, i.e., the model averaging estimators for longitudinal data with discrete responses, conditional prediction in spatial data and quantile regression in the presence of a potential correlation structure are investigated accordingly. Section 3 studies the asymptotic properties of the proposed unified model averaging method when the number of candidate models is assumed to be fixed. These results are then extended to the situation with a divergent number of candidate models in Section 4. Section 5 provides the development and theoretical analysis for the SEAL. Simulation studies are conducted

in Section 6 to assess the finite-sample performance of the proposed method. Section 7 examines a case study to demonstrate the method’s usefulness. Section 8 concludes. Additional theoretical results, proofs, further discussions, and additional simulations and case studies are also provided in the Supplemental Materials.

## 2 Unified model averaging based on CV

Our goal in the current section is to derive the unified formulation of model averaging based on CV. For the  $i$ th subject, we have an  $n_i$ -dimensional response  $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{in_i})^\top$  and  $n_i \times p$  dimensional matrix of covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i = (\mathbf{X}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{in_i})^\top$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n\}$  represents the observable samples with  $\mathcal{D}_i = \{\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{X}_i\}$ . We assume that  $n_i$ ’s are fixed. When  $n_i > 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  is a dataset with multivariate responses. Whereas, when  $n_i = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  reduces to a common dataset. Moreover, denote  $\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_i)\} = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{f}_{0,i})$ , where  $\mathbf{g} : R^{n_i} \rightarrow R^{n_i}$  and  $\mathbf{h} : R^{n_i} \rightarrow R^{n_i}$  are known vector valued-functions,  $\mathbf{f}_{0,i}$  is an unknown  $n_i \times 1$  vector consisting of parameters of interest and in the remaining article, we assume that  $\|\mathbf{f}_{0,i}\|$ ’s are bounded above by a positive constant. This framework is flexible in general. For example, if the mean function of  $Y_{ij}$ , denoted by  $\mu_{ij}$ , is of interest, then  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = \mathbf{Y}_i$  and  $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{f}_{0,i}) = \mathbf{f}_{0,i} = (\mu_{i1}, \dots, \mu_{in_i})^\top$ ; If the aim is the variance of  $Y_{ij}$ , say  $v_{ij}$ , then  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = \{(Y_{i1} - \mu_{i1})^2, \dots, (Y_{in_i} - \mu_{in_i})^2\}^\top$  and  $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{f}_{0,i}) = \mathbf{f}_{0,i} = (v_{i1}, \dots, v_{in_i})^\top$ . In addition, as in Lu and Su (2015), consider a one-dimensional case with  $\mathbf{Y}_i = Y_i$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{0,i} = f_{0,i}$  being the  $\alpha$ -quantile of  $Y_i$ , if  $Y_i = f_{0,i} + \epsilon_i$ , where  $\epsilon_i$ ’s are unobservable error terms. Then,  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = 1_{(-\infty, f_{0,i}]}(Y_i)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{f}_{0,i}) = P(Y_i \leq f_{0,i}) = \alpha$ , where  $1_{\{\cdot\}}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function.

To recover  $\mathbf{f}_{0,i}$  from the observable data, we consider  $S$  candidate models. We first consider the situation where  $S$  is fixed and then extend the results to the situation with divergent  $S$ . Under the  $s$ th candidate model ( $s = 1, \dots, S$ ),  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}$  is the candidate es-

estimator of  $\mathbf{f}_{0,i}$  based on  $\mathcal{D}$ . Moreover, let  $\mathbf{Y}_i^0$  be the value that needs to be predicted based on  $\mathcal{D}$  and satisfies that  $\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_i^0)\} = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{Y}_i)\} = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{f}_{0,i})$ . Unlike the standard setup in most existing model selection/averaging literature where  $\mathbf{Y}^0 = (\mathbf{Y}_1^{0\top}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n^{0\top})^\top$  is an independent copy of  $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{Y}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_n^\top)^\top$  (e.g. in Section 3.4 of Konishi and Kitagawa (2007) and Zhang et al. (2016)), in the current study, we allow more flexible structure where  $\mathbf{Y}^0$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  can be dependent. This allows us to analyze and improve the performance of prediction in the form of  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Y}_i^0 | \mathbf{Y})$ , see Example 2 for more details. Throughout this study, we aim to predict  $\mathbf{Y}_i^0$  by constructing a model averaging estimator based on  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(1),i}, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(S),i}$ . Let  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_S)^\top$  be the vector of weights which belongs to the set  $\mathcal{W} = \{\mathbf{w} \in [0, 1]^S : \sum_{s=1}^S w_s = 1\}$ . The unified model averaging estimator has a general form

$$\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{s=1}^S w_s \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}. \quad (1)$$

The model averaging estimator provided in (1) contains a wide class of model averaging estimators and within this framework, we propose three novel model averaging estimators that have never been considered in the literature before.

**Example 1.** When focusing on discrete longitudinal data, investigators usually only have partial information about the population distribution. To overcome this difficulty, Liang and Zeger (1986) introduced a generalized estimating equation (GEE) framework, where only the first/second order moment assumptions are imposed. To be specific, assume that  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Y}_i) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_i = (\mu_{i1}, \dots, \mu_{in_i})^\top$ . The estimation theory of GEE has been studied extensively in literature (see for example Wang (2011) and Ratcliffe and Shults (2008)). In practical situations, we impose parametric assumptions on  $\mu_{ij}$  and the correlation structure, which may be based on different combinations of covariates or working correlation matrices. This leads to multiple candidate models (i.e., candidate GEEs). In the  $s$ th candidate GEE,  $\mu_{ij}$  is assumed to have form  $m(\mathbf{X}_{(s),ij}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)})$ , where  $m(\cdot)$  is the pre-specified mean function and  $\mathbf{X}_{(s),ij}$  is a  $p_s$ -dimensional vector which consists of some elements of  $\mathbf{X}_{ij}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)}$  is the

corresponding coefficient vector for the  $s$ th model. Let  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)}$  be the GEE estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)}$  obtained based on  $\mathcal{D}$ . We aim to find the prediction of  $\mathbf{Y}^0$ , which is an independent copy of  $\mathbf{Y}$ . This is equivalent to constructing the out-of-sample prediction of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$  and now  $\mathbf{f}_{0,i} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ . Under the  $s$ th GEE, the prediction of  $\mathbf{f}_{0,i}$  is  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i} = \{m(\mathbf{X}_{(s),i1}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)}), \dots, m(\mathbf{X}_{(s),in_i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)})\}^\top$  and this yields that  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\mathbf{w}) = \{\sum_{s=1}^S w_s m(\mathbf{X}_{(s),i1}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)}), \dots, \sum_{s=1}^S w_s m(\mathbf{X}_{(s),in_i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)})\}^\top$ , where  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)}$  is the estimator obtained by solving the  $s$ th GEE.

**Example 2.** Spatial autoregressive (SAR) models (Lee, 2004; Martellosio and Hillier, 2020) are widely used in geostatistics and economics. We assume that the data are generated by  $\mathbf{Y} = \rho_0 \mathbf{A}_0 \mathbf{Y} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 + \mathbf{V}$ , where  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top$  is the vector of responses, observed in the region under study,  $n$  is the number of spatial units,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = (\eta_{0,1}, \dots, \eta_{0,n})^\top$  is an unknown  $n \times 1$  vector that contains unit level information,  $\mathbf{A}_0 = (a_{0,ij})_{n \times n}$  is the unknown true spatial weight matrix with  $a_{0,ii} = 0$ ,  $\rho_0$  is the unknown scalar autoregressive parameter and  $\mathbf{V}$  is the  $n \times 1$  vector of independent disturbance with zero mean and finite variance  $\sigma^2$ . Assume that we have  $S$  candidate models at hand, where the  $s$ th candidate model is defined as  $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}_{(s)} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)} + \rho_{(s)} \mathbf{A}_{(s)} \mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{V}_{(s)}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_{(s)}$  is the  $n \times p_s$  dimensional matrix of constant regressors,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)}$  is the corresponding vector of regression coefficients,  $\mathbf{A}_{(s)} = (a_{(s),ij})_{n \times n}$  is the working spatial weight matrix with  $a_{(s),ii} = 0$  (usually specified based on prior knowledge of the investigators) and  $\mathbf{V}_{(s)} \sim N(\mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}, \sigma_{(s)}^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ . It is worthwhile noting that the  $s$ th model is subject to potential misspecification on both the linear predictors and spatial weight matrix, i.e.,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$  cannot to be written as  $\mathbf{X}_{(s)} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)}^0$  for any  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)}^0$  and  $\mathbf{A}_{(s)} \neq \mathbf{A}_0$ . Now, let  $\mathbf{Y}^0 = (Y_1^0, \dots, Y_n^0)^\top$  be another set of spatial units which is unobservable but connects to  $\mathbf{Y}$  by  $\mathbf{Y}^0 = \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 + \rho_0 \mathbf{A}_0 \mathbf{Y} + \mathbf{V}^0$ , where  $\mathbf{V}^0$  is an independent copy of  $\mathbf{V}$ . This setup allows us to study the predictions for out-of-region units based on observable sample  $\mathbf{Y}$ . In this scenario,  $n_i \equiv 1$ . The best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP) of  $Y_i^0$  is  $\mathbb{E}(Y_i^0 \mid \mathbf{Y}) = \eta_{0,i} + \rho_0 \sum_{j=1}^n a_{0,ij} Y_j$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{0,i} = f_{0,i} = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}(Y_i^0 \mid \mathbf{Y})\} = \eta_{0,i} + \rho_0 \sum_{j=1}^n a_{0,ij} \mathbb{E}(Y_j)$ . Therefore, under the  $s$ th model, the working empirical BLUP

becomes  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i} = \widehat{f}_{(s),i} = \mathbf{X}_{(s),i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)} + \widehat{\rho}_{(s)} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{(s),ij} Y_j$ , where  $\mathbf{X}_{(s),i}^\top$  is the  $i$ th row of  $\mathbf{X}_{(s)}$ ,  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)}$  and  $\widehat{\rho}_{(s)}$  are some reasonable estimators (e.g. the maximum likelihood estimators (Lee, 2004), least square estimators (Lee, 2002) or adjusted maximum likelihood estimators (Yu et al., 2015)) of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)}$  and  $\rho_{(s)}$ , respectively. Given  $\mathbf{w}$ , the working empirical BLUP of  $Y_i^0$  through model averaging is  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\mathbf{w}) = \widehat{f}_i(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{s=1}^S w_s (\mathbf{X}_{(s),i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)} + \widehat{\rho}_{(s)} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{(s),ij} Y_j)$ .

**Example 3.** Providing much more information than the mean regression model (Lu and Su, 2015), quantile regression (QR) (Koenker and Bassett, 1978) plays an important role in statistics and econometrics. Due to the complexity of quantile function, studying model averaging in QR is difficult in general. In a seminal study, Lu and Su (2015) investigated the optimal model averaging based on cross validation and a Mallows'  $C_p$ -type weight choice criterion, where the observations are assumed to be independent. Recently, Wang et al. (2023) proposed a frequentist model averaging method for quantile regression with high-dimensional covariates in the situation where the observations are independent. In the current article, we remove the assumption of independence. We consider that  $Y_i^0 = f_{0,i} + \epsilon_i^0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^0 = (\epsilon_1^0, \dots, \epsilon_n^0)^\top$  is an independent copy of  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  and  $\text{cov}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}) = \text{cov}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^0) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} > 0$ . We aim to estimate the  $\alpha$ -quantile of  $Y_i^0$ . We consider  $S$  candidate models and the  $\alpha$ -quantile under the  $s$ th candidate model is assumed to have the form  $f_{(s),i} = \mathbf{X}_{(s),i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)}$ , where  $\mathbf{X}_{(s),i}$  is a  $p_s$ -dimensional sub-vector of covariates vector  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . Under model  $s$ , the QR estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(s)}$  is  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)}$  and thus the model averaging estimator of  $f_{0,i}$  is  $\widehat{f}_i(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{s=1}^S w_s \mathbf{X}_{(s),i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(s)}$ .

To select appropriate weights, we define the loss function as follows:

$$L_n(\mathbf{w}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_i^0} \left[ Q \left\{ \mathbf{Y}_i^0, \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\mathbf{w}) \right\} \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_i} \left\{ Q(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_{0,i}) \right\} \right), \quad (2)$$

where  $-2Q(\cdot, \cdot)$  is any well-defined measure of divergence,  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\mathbf{w})$  is obtained based on the observable data  $\mathcal{D}$ , and the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_i^0}(\cdot)$  (or  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_i}(\cdot)$ ) is taken with respect to the probability density function of  $\mathbf{Y}_i^0$  (or  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ ). When it is clear from the context, we shall



suppress the use of subscripts in the expectations. This loss function measures the power of  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\mathbf{w})$  in predicting  $\mathbf{Y}_i^0$ . Now we investigate the loss functions in three important practical situations discussed in Examples 1–3.

**Example 1** (continued). Under GEE, since there is no explicit form for the likelihood function, the following quasi-likelihood (Severini and Staniswalis, 1994; Pan, 2001) is employed,  $Q(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{u}_i) = a^{-1}(\phi) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \int_{r_{ij}}^{u_{ij}} (r_{ij} - t)v^{-1}(t)dt$ , where both  $\mathbf{r}_i = (r_{i1}, \dots, r_{in_i})^\top$  and  $\mathbf{u}_i = (u_{i1}, \dots, u_{in_i})^\top$  are  $n_i \times 1$  general vectors. The quasi-likelihood allows us to assess the prediction loss of statistical models in discrete longitudinal data, without imposing full distributional assumptions. If  $Y_{ij}$  takes value from  $\{0, 1\}$  with  $P(Y_{ij} = 1) = \mu_{ij} = 1 - P(Y_{ij} = 0)$ , we can set  $v(t) = t(1 - t)$  and  $a(\phi) = 1$ . Then,

$$L_n(\mathbf{w}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[ \mu_{ij} \log \left\{ \frac{\widehat{f}_{ij}(\mathbf{w})}{1 - \widehat{f}_{ij}(\mathbf{w})} \right\} + \log \left\{ 1 - \widehat{f}_{ij}(\mathbf{w}) \right\} - \mu_{ij} \log \left( \frac{\mu_{ij}}{1 - \mu_{ij}} \right) - \log(1 - \mu_{ij}) \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $\widehat{f}_{ij}(\mathbf{w})$  is the  $j$ th entry of  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\mathbf{w})$  defined in Equation (1). Moreover, if  $Y_{ij}$  takes value from  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{ij}) = \mu_{ij} > 0$ , we can set  $v(t) = t$  and  $a(\phi) = 1$ . Then, it can be verified that

$$L_n(\mathbf{w}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[ \mu_{ij} \log \left\{ \widehat{f}_{ij}(\mathbf{w}) \right\} - \widehat{f}_{ij}(\mathbf{w}) - \mu_{ij} \log(\mu_{ij}) + \mu_{ij} \right]. \quad (4)$$

**Remark 1.** In (3) and (4), we employed a “working independent” strategy to construct the loss function where the within-cluster correlation structure is ignored. Modeling the correlation or covariance matrix also plays an important role in the literature studying clustered data. In the context of GEE and longitudinal data analysis, the parameter estimation of GEE and correlation structure modeling have been studied in a series of seminal papers, e.g., in Qu et al. (2000), Qu and Lindsay (2003) and Zhou and Qu (2012), among others. However, with the presence of potential correlation structure, the development of model averaging is not trivial. Inspired by Example 1, we provide formal theoretical development of MACV and numerical studies under our unified framework in Section S.1.3 and Design

*S.2 in Section S.4.1 of the Supplementary Materials, respectively.*

**Example 2** (continued). Under the SAR model, we can simply take  $Q(r_i, u_i) = -(r_i - u_i)^2/2$  and this leads to

$$L_n(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{f_{0,i} - \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{w})\}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{var}(Y_i^0) - \sum_{i=1}^n \text{var}(Y_i). \quad (5)$$

**Example 3** (continued). Under the QR model, we take  $Q(r_i, u_i) = -(r_i - u_i)\{\alpha - 1_{(-\infty, 0]}(r_i - u_i)\}/2$ . Since no specific assumption about the structure of  $\Sigma$  is imposed, we will work on the “working-independent” loss function

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(\mathbf{w}) = & \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{Y_i^0} \left( \{Y_i^0 - \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{w})\} \left[ \alpha - 1_{(-\infty, 0]} \{Y_i^0 - \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{w})\} \right] \right) \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon_i} \left[ \epsilon_i \{ \alpha - 1_{(-\infty, 0]}(\epsilon_i) \} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It is readily seen from the definition of  $L_n(\mathbf{w})$  in (2) that  $\sum_{i=1}^n Q(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_{0,i})$  only serves as a normalization factor and is unrelated to  $\mathbf{w}$ . Thus, to minimize  $L_n(\mathbf{w})$  is equivalent to minimizing  $-2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}_i^0} \left[ Q \left\{ \mathbf{Y}_i^0, \hat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\mathbf{w}) \right\} \right]$ . This equivalence inspires us to utilize the following CV-based weight choice criterion:  $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathbf{w}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n Q \left\{ \mathbf{Y}_i, \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{i,[-i]}(\mathbf{w}) \right\}$ , where  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{i,[-i]}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{s=1}^S w_s \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}^{[-i]}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}^{[-i]}$  is some reasonable prediction of  $\mathbf{f}_{0,i}$  based on the data  $\mathbf{X}_i \cup (\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_i)$ , obtained under the  $s$ th candidate model. When  $n_i = 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we refer to the CV as leave-one-out CV, otherwise, we term it as leave-subject-out CV. The weights are obtained by minimizing  $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \text{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{C}_n(\mathbf{w})$  and we term the resulting  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_i(\hat{\mathbf{w}})$  as model averaging estimator by cross validation or MACV.

## 3 Asymptotic properties for fixed $S$

### 3.1 Weak consistency and asymptotic optimality of $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$

All limiting processes considered in the current paper correspond to  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , yet  $n_i$ 's are fixed. Based on the loss function  $L_n(\mathbf{w})$ , we can define the risk function as  $R_n(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{Y}} \{L_n(\mathbf{w})\}$ . We will establish the asymptotic optimality for  $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$  in the sense of minimizing

the prediction risk  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$ . To carry this agenda further, we introduce more notations. Use  $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_1$  and  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$  to denote the spectral norm, maximum column sum matrix norm and maximum row sum matrix norm (Horn and Johnson, 1990) of a general matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , respectively. In the remaining part of the paper, denote by  $c_0$  and  $c_1$  the generic constants that may vary from case to case.

Let  $\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^*$  be the limiting value of candidate estimator  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}$  in the sense that there exists a positive constant  $c_1$  such that  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \left\| a_n \left( \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i} - \mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^* \right) \right\|^2 \leq c_1$ , uniformly for every  $s = 1, \dots, S$ , where  $a_n \rightarrow \infty$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In model averaging,  $\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^*$  serves as the pseudo-true aggregator (Gospodinov and Maasoumi, 2021) which relates closely to the notion of pseudo-true value (White, 1982; Lv and Liu, 2014). Moreover, the sequence  $a_n$  can be very different for different scenarios. In Section S.3.2.1 of the Supplementary Materials, we investigate the behavior of  $a_n$  and demonstrate the relationships between  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^*$  and pseudo-true values under Examples 1, 2 and 3.

Now define  $\mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{s=1}^S w_s \mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^*$ ,

$$R_n^*(\mathbf{w}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [Q\{\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{w})\} - Q(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_{0,i})], \quad (7)$$

$\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{w}) = Q\{\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{w})\} - Q(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_{0,i})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{w}) = \{\varepsilon_1(\mathbf{w}), \dots, \varepsilon_n(\mathbf{w})\}^\top$ . We state some regularity assumptions for establishing asymptotic properties.

**Assumption 1.** There exists a positive constant  $c_1$  such that for each  $s = 1, \dots, S$ ,  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \|a_n(\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}^{[-i]} - \mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^*)\|^2 \leq c_1$ , and  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^*\| \leq c_1$ .

**Assumption 2.** (i) For each  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , there exists a  $u(\mathbf{w}) < \infty$  such that  $\|\text{cov}\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{w})\}\| \leq u(\mathbf{w})$ , and (ii) there exists a positive constant  $c_1$  such that for any  $n_i$ -dimensional vectors  $\mathbf{f}_i$  and  $\mathbf{f}'_i$  in the parameter space,  $|Q(\mathbf{Z}_i, \mathbf{f}_i) - Q(\mathbf{Z}_i, \mathbf{f}'_i)| \leq K(\mathbf{Z}_i) \|\mathbf{f}_i - \mathbf{f}'_i\|$ , where  $\mathbf{Z}_i = \mathbf{Y}_i$  or  $\mathbf{Y}_i^0$ , and  $K(\mathbf{Z}_i)$  is independent of  $\mathbf{f}_i$  and  $\mathbf{f}'_i$  and satisfies  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}^{1/2} |K(\mathbf{Z}_i)|^2 \leq c_1$ .

Assumption 1 concerns the properties of candidate predictions/estimators and essentially means that  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}^{[-i]}$  share the same limiting value that is bounded above. In

Section 5, we show that if  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}^{[-i]}$  can be indexed by a parameter vector, then Assumption 1 can be replaced by a group of more straightforward assumptions that ensures the moment bounds, identifiability and smoothness of the estimating equations. Further discussions are provided in Section S.3.2.2 of the Supplementary Materials. Assumption 2 regulates the behavior of the loss function. In specific, Assumption 2 (i) poses basic point-wise moment condition to  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{w})$ , and part (ii) guarantees the stochastic equicontinuity of  $Q(\cdot, \cdot)$  with respect to  $\mathbf{f}_i$ . A similar form of this condition can be found in Condition R3 of Flynn et al. (2013), where model selection in misspecified GLM was studied. Unlike in Flynn et al. (2013), we avoid assuming that the derivatives of  $Q(\cdot, \cdot)$  to exist so that our result applies to a wider class of loss functions (e.g. the check loss considered in Example 3). Part (ii) of Assumption 2 also implies the existence of minimizer of  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$  in  $\mathcal{W}$ . In particular, for each  $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{W}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n} R_n(\mathbf{w}) - \frac{1}{n} R_n(\mathbf{w}') \right| &\leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}^{1/2} |K(\mathbf{Y}_i^0)|^2 \max_{1 \leq s \leq S} \mathbb{E}^{1/2} \|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}\|^2 \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_1 \\ &\leq 2c_1^2 (1 + a_n^{-1}) \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}'\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

which yields that  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$  is a continuous function of  $\mathbf{w}$ . Therefore, in light of  $\mathcal{W}$  being compact, by the extreme value theorem, there is a  $\mathbf{w}^* \in \mathcal{W}$  such that  $\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_n(\mathbf{w}) = R_n(\mathbf{w}^*)$ .

It is seen from (7) that  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$  is evaluated at  $\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^*$  and in view of the fact that  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i} - \mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^* = o_p(1)$ ,  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$  essentially serves as the limiting risk. Define  $\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{C}_n(\mathbf{w}) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n Q(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_{0,i})$ ,

where the last term is free from  $\mathbf{w}$ . It follows that  $\operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{C}_n(\mathbf{w}) = \widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})$ .

In the remaining part of this paper, we study the asymptotic properties of  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$  based on  $\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})$ . In fact,  $\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})$ ,  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$  and  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$  are closely related. To see this, denote  $\nu_n = \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [Q\{\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{w})\} - Q\{\mathbf{Y}_i^0, \mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{w})\}] \right|$ , then we have the following result.

**Theorem 1.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, (i)  $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} |\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})/n - R_n^*(\mathbf{w})/n| = o_p(1)$ , as*

$n \rightarrow \infty$ ; if  $\nu_n/n = o(1)$  and  $\mathbf{w}^*$  is a well-separated minimum of  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$ , i.e., for a given  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\inf_{\{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}: \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\| > \delta\}} R_n(\mathbf{w}) > R_n(\mathbf{w}^*)$ , then  $\|\widehat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}^*\| = o_p(1)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

The proof of the theorem is provided in Section S.2.1 of the Supplemental Materials. The proof is not technically trivial because  $\mathbf{w}$  is embedded in  $\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})$  or  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$  in a complicated manner and stochastic equicontinuity (Newey, 1991) plays a pivotal role in the proof of Theorem 1. In this theorem, we require that  $\nu_n/n \rightarrow 0$ , which essentially means that  $\mathbf{Y}^0$  is predictable given  $\mathbf{Y}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}^0$  should share a certain degree of similarity. This notion is similar to the notion of transformability in transfer learning (Tian and Feng, 2023). To be specific, when  $\mathbf{Y}^0$  is an independent copy of  $\mathbf{Y}$  (as in Examples 1, 3 and existing literature concerning model selection or model averaging),  $\nu_n \equiv 0$ . Whereas in Example 2, under the standard assumptions imposed by Lee (2002, 2004), we show that  $\nu_n/n = O(h_n^{-1}) = o(1)$  in Section S.3.1.3 of the Supplemental Materials.

Theorem 1 is the first result to establish the weak consistency of  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$  in unified model averaging and the results obtained in Zhang et al. (2020) and Feng et al. (2021) can be viewed as special cases of Theorem 1 under the scenario therein. The assumption that  $\mathbf{w}^*$  is a “well-separated minimum” is weaker than convexity (further discussion of this notion can be found in Section 5.2 of van der Vaart (2000)). It is also worthwhile noting that if we further assume that  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$  is a strictly convex function of  $\mathbf{w}$ , then the assumption about “well-separated minimum” is satisfied evidently and  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$  attains its unique minimum at  $\mathbf{w}^*$  in the convex set  $\mathcal{W}$ . In this case, by minimizing  $\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})$ , we can recover the *unique* minimizer of  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$ , asymptotically.

Theorem 1 shows that  $n^{-1}\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})$  is a uniformly consistent estimator of the limiting risk  $n^{-1}R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$ . Therefore, it is expected that when minimizing  $\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})$ , the limiting risk  $n^{-1}R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$  is also minimized. Furthermore, since  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$ , as the limiting risk corresponding to  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$ , should be close to  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$  for sufficiently large  $n$ , we expect that  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$  is also minimized asymptotically. In Theorem 2, we will verify this con-

ture. To this end, let  $\widehat{d}_n(\mathbf{w}) = -2\sum_{i=1}^n [Q\{\mathbf{Y}_i, \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{i,[-i]}(\mathbf{w})\} - Q\{\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{w})\}]/R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$  and  $\widehat{q}_n(\mathbf{w}) = -2\sum_{i=1}^n [Q\{\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{w})\} - Q(\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{f}_{0,i})]/R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$ . We need some additional assumptions. Let  $\xi_n = \inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$ .

**Assumption 3.** There is a  $\widehat{K}_n = O_p(1)$  such that for all  $\mathbf{w}'$  and  $\mathbf{w}$  in  $\mathcal{W}$ ,  $|\widehat{d}_n(\mathbf{w}') - \widehat{d}_n(\mathbf{w})| \leq \widehat{K}_n \|\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}\|$  and  $|\widehat{q}_n(\mathbf{w}') - \widehat{q}_n(\mathbf{w})| \leq \widehat{K}_n \|\mathbf{w}' - \mathbf{w}\|$ .

**Assumption 4.** As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\max(n/a_n, n^{1/2})/\xi_n = o(1)$  and  $\nu_n/\xi_n = o(1)$ .

Assumption 3 regulates the behavior of the loss function normalized by  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})^{-1}$  and guarantees the stochastic equicontinuity of  $\widehat{d}_n(\mathbf{w})$  and  $\widehat{q}_n(\mathbf{w})$  with respect to  $\mathbf{w}$ . This is analogous to Assumption 3A in Newey (1991) and can be replaced by Assumption 2 (ii) when  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} n/\xi_n \rightarrow 1/c_0 < \infty$  for some positive constant  $c_0$  (like in the setup of Theorem 3.3 of Lu and Su (2015)). Please see Section S.3.1.2 for more detailed discussions. Assumption 4 regulates the lower bound of limiting risk  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$  in  $\mathcal{W}$  and requires that  $\xi_n$  grows faster than  $n/a_n$ ,  $n^{1/2}$  and  $\nu_n$ . Similar conditions have also been used in Zhang et al. (2016) and Ando and Li (2014). Now we provide some further insights into this condition and we introduce the following definition, which is new in the literature.

**Definition 1** (Definitions for correctly specified models). (i) The model  $s$  is said to be

correctly specified *in the exact sense*, if  $\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^* \equiv \mathbf{f}_{0,i}$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , i.e., its pseudo-true aggregator is identical to the true parameter of interest.

(ii) If the model  $s$  is not correctly specified in the exact sense, but satisfies that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^* - \mathbf{f}_{0,i}\| \rightarrow 0$ , we say the model is correctly specified *in the asymptotic sense*.

In some of the most commonly used  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$ , we can always find a fixed positive constant  $K_1$  such that

$$R_n^*(\mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{1}{K_1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{s=1}^S w_s (\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^* - \mathbf{f}_{0,i}) \right\|^2. \quad (8)$$

In S.3.1.4 of the Supplemental Materials, we verify (8) in Examples 1, 2 and 3. Denote  $\boldsymbol{\delta}_i = (\mathbf{f}_{(1),i}^* - \mathbf{f}_{0,i}, \dots, \mathbf{f}_{(S),i}^* - \mathbf{f}_{0,i})^\top$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n = (\boldsymbol{\delta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\delta}_n)^\top$ .  $\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n$  captures the information that reflects the difference between the pseudo-true aggregator and true data generating process. Denote by  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$  the minimum eigenvalue of a general symmetric matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ .

Note that  $\|\mathbf{w}\|_1 = \sum_{s=1}^S |w_s| = 1$ . We have

$$R_n^*(\mathbf{w}) \geq \mathbf{w}^\top \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\delta}_i \boldsymbol{\delta}_i^\top}{K_1} \mathbf{w} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n) \|\mathbf{w}\|^2}{K_1} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n) \|\mathbf{w}\|_1^2}{K_1 S} = \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n)}{K_1 S}.$$

The above argument indicates that  $\xi_n = \inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_n^*(\mathbf{w}) \geq K_1^{-1} S^{-1} \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n)$ , which yields that Assumption 4 holds evidently if  $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n)$  grows faster than  $\max(n/a_n, n^{1/2})$  and  $\nu_n$ . For fixed dimensional parametric regression models, Assumption 4 is typically violated if one or more correctly specified models lie within the candidate model set, in the exact sense. That is, if for  $s = s_0$ , one has  $\mathbf{f}_{s_0,i}^* \equiv \mathbf{f}_{0,i}$ , then by the definition of  $R_n^*(\mathbf{w})$ , we have  $\xi_n = \inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_n^*(\mathbf{w}) = R_n^*(\mathbf{w}_{s_0}^0) = 0$ , where  $\mathbf{w}_s^0$  is the  $S \times 1$ -dimensional vector whose  $s$ th element is one and the others are zeros. However, in the context of nonparametric regression models, when some fitting models are correctly specified in the asymptotic sense, if the fitting error is dominated by approximation error, then Assumption 4 can still be satisfied (see Racine et al. (2023) for the definition of correct model in nonparametric setting). It is also worthwhile noting that Assumption 4 poses a requirement for the divergence rate of  $\nu_n$ , which essentially means that given  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}^0$  is predictable relative to  $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n)$ . In particular, in Examples 1 and 3, where  $\mathbf{Y}^0$  is an independent copy of  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\nu_n/\xi_n \equiv 0$ . Whereas in Example 2, under the standard assumptions imposed by Lee (2002, 2004), we show in Section S.3.1.3 of the Supplemental Materials that  $\nu_n = O(nh_n^{-1})$ , which indicates that Assumption 4 holds when  $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Upsilon}_n)$  grows faster than  $n/h_n^{1/2}$ . Now we are ready to establish the asymptotic optimality for  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ .

**Theorem 2 (Asymptotic optimality).** *Under Assumptions 1–4, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have*

$$\frac{R_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}})}{\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_n(\mathbf{w})} \rightarrow 1, \tag{9}$$

*in probability.*

The proof of Theorem 2 is provided in Section S.2.2 of the Supplemental Materials. Again, the stochastic equicontinuity (Newey, 1991) plays a pivotal role in the proof. Theorem 2 demonstrates that by minimizing the proposed weight choice criterion  $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , the obtained  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$  is asymptotically optimal in the sense that its prediction accuracy measured by the risk function is asymptotically identical to that based on the best yet infeasible weight vector. This theorem provides the theoretical underpinning for MACV.

### 3.2 The asymptotic behavior of $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ when there is at least one correctly specified candidate model in the exact sense

In Theorem 2, we show that the proposed model averaging method is asymptotically optimal in the sense of minimizing the prediction risk. Playing a pivotal role in the proof of Theorem 2, Assumption 4 rules out the situation where there is at least one correctly specified candidate model in the exact sense (Flynn et al. (2013) refers to this as “true model world”). Then, a natural question is that in the “true model world”, can we consistently identify all the correct models based on  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ ? We answer this question now.

Assume that  $D$  is a non-empty set that contains all the labels of the correctly specified models in the exact sense. Consider a restricted weight set  $\overline{\mathcal{W}}_D = \{\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_S)^\top \in \mathcal{W} : w_s \equiv 0 \text{ if } s \in D\}$ . To study the behavior of  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ , we assume  $D \neq \{1, \dots, S\}$  and this means that at least one of the candidate models is misspecified. If  $D = \{1, \dots, S\}$ , the conclusion in the following Theorem 3 holds evidently. We need the following additional assumption.

**Assumption 5.** There are two positive constants  $c_0$  and  $K_1$  such that, (i) for every  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$   $R_n^*(\mathbf{w}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{f}_i^*(\mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{f}_{0,i}\|^2 / K_1$ ; (ii)  $\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \overline{\mathcal{W}}_D} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{s \notin D} w_s (\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}^* - \mathbf{f}_{0,i}) \right\|^2 / n \geq c_0$  for sufficiently large  $n$ .

Part (i) of Assumption 5 is very mild, and is satisfied under the standard setup of Exam-



ples 1, 2 and 3 (see Section S.3.1.4 of the Supplemental Materials for further discussions). Part (ii) of Assumption 5 means that not all the candidate models are correctly specified in the exact sense and the corresponding misspecification error does not vanish as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 3** (Consistency of  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$  in identifying the exactly correct models). *If Assumptions 1, 2 and 5 are satisfied, then we have  $\sum_{s \in D} \widehat{w}_s \rightarrow 1$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\widehat{w}_s$  is the  $s$ th entry of  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ .*

The proof of Theorem 3 is provided in Section S.2.3 of the Supplemental Materials. This result implies that when there are some correctly specified models in the exact sense, and the sample size is sufficiently large, our method can successfully identify all these exactly correct models and reduce the weights for the misspecified models to zeros. Theorems 2 and 3 are established under very different situations. The former one is built under the case where there is no correctly specified model, whereas the latter one is derived under the case where at least one of the working models is correctly specified. These two theorems provide theoretical supports for the use of our MACV under the different practical situations.

## 4 Asymptotic properties with divergent $S$

We now study the asymptotic properties of the proposed method in the context where  $S \rightarrow \infty$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which is commonly encountered for high-dimensional regressions or nonparametric regressions. Denote  $z_i(\mathbf{w}) = \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{w}) - \mathbb{E}\{\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{w})\}$ . In the remaining part of the current section, we assume that for each  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $z_i(\mathbf{w})$ 's satisfy the *mixing condition* given in (S.5). We aim to extend the results in Theorems 1, 2 and 3 into the scenario with divergent  $S$ . This type of study is difficult in general. The reason is that for divergent  $S$ , we cannot adopt equicontinuity directly to analyze the uniform convergence properties of  $\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})$  over  $\mathcal{W}$  and there is no immediate concentration inequality that can be used in our setting. For this purpose, we establish a variant of Bernstein-type inequality under the situ-

ation where observations are non-independent and not necessarily identically distributed by modifying the work of Modha and Masry (1996) and Merlevede et al. (2009), whose version works for stationary time series and stochastic process, respectively. Modha and Masry's version can be treated as our special case. The variant can be used in the cross-sectional setting with potential spatial or network dependence. The inequality is of interest itself and may be independently useful. We have the following results.

**Theorem 4.** *Under Assumptions S.1–S.3 of the Supplementary Materials, for each  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , assume that  $z_i(\mathbf{w})$ 's satisfy the mixing condition given in (S.5), then, (i)  $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} |\mathcal{C}_n^0(\mathbf{w})/n - R_n^*(\mathbf{w})/n| = o_p(1)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ; (ii) if  $\nu_n/n = o(1)$  and  $\mathbf{w}^*$  is a well-separated minimum of  $R_n(\mathbf{w})$ , i.e., for a given  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\inf_{\{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}: \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_\infty > \delta\}} R_n(\mathbf{w}) > R_n(\mathbf{w}^*)$ , then  $\|\widehat{\mathbf{w}} - \mathbf{w}^*\|_\infty = o_p(1)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

The proof of Theorem 4 is provided in Section S.2.4 of the Supplemental Materials. Now we establish the asymptotic optimality of  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ .

**Theorem 5 (Asymptotic optimality under divergent  $S$ ).** *Under Assumptions S.1, S.2 and S.4 of the Supplementary Materials, for each  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , assume that  $z_i(\mathbf{w})$ 's satisfy the mixing condition given in (S.5), we have, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$   $R_n(\widehat{\mathbf{w}})/\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_n(\mathbf{w}) \rightarrow 1$ , in probability.*

The proof of Theorem 5 is provided in Section S.2.5 of the Supplemental Materials. Moreover, when there is at least one correctly specified candidate model in the exact sense, we can also develop the consistency theory for  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ .

**Theorem 6 (Consistency of  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$  in identifying the exactly correct models).** *If Assumption 5 and S.1–S.3 of the Supplementary Materials are satisfied, for each  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , assume that  $z_i(\mathbf{w})$ 's satisfy the mixing condition given in (S.5), then we have  $\sum_{s \in D} \widehat{w}_s \rightarrow 1$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\widehat{w}_s$  is the  $s$ th entry of  $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ .*

Under the same framework as that which proves Theorem 3, the proof of Theorem 6 is straightforward using the results established in Theorem 4 and is omitted.

## 5 A fast MACV based on the second-order-approximation

### 5.1 A fast algorithm for leave-one/subject-out estimators

To obtain the weight choice criterion  $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , one needs to remove  $\mathcal{D}_i$  from the full dataset and conduct parameter estimation or learner training based on  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_i$  for all the  $s = 1, \dots, S$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . The procedure is repeated for  $n \times S$  times, which is deemed computationally burdensome, and this restricts the use of MACV when the candidate models are complicated. The problem becomes much severe when  $n$  and/or  $S$  are/is large. This severity inspires us to consider a more efficient method to alleviate the computational burden. Developing the fast CV algorithm is an important issue in machine learning and statistical inference. Focusing on the kernel-based regression, Debruyne et al. (2008) considered a fast algorithm based on evaluating the influence functions at a specific sample distribution to obtain an approximation of the CV criterion. Krueger et al. (2015) proposed an improved CV procedure which uses nonparametric sequential test to speed up the conventional CV. Moreover, Liu et al. (2020b) proposed a fast CV for kernel-based regression based on the Bouligand influence function (BIF), which also requires the explicit expressions of BIF. However, these existing methods cannot be applied in our context, where the data structures, loss functions, and candidate estimators are more complicated. Also, there is no immediate theory for nonparametric sequential tests under non-independent situations nor explicit expression for BIF.

In this section, we assume that  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}$  is indexed by  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i} = \mathbf{f}_{(s),i}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})$ , where  $\mathbf{f}_{(s),i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})$  is an  $n_i$ -dimensional vector valued function,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}$  is the a  $q_s$ -dimensional vector of

estimators for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}$ , obtained by solving the estimating equation  $\mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)} \mid \mathcal{D}) = 0_{q_s \times 1}$ , and  $q_s$  is allowed to diverge as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and satisfies  $\max_{1 \leq s \leq S} q_s/n \rightarrow 0$ . It is also worthwhile noting that although we use the term ‘‘parameter’’, our framework can also be used to nonparametric or semiparametric regression. The leave-one/subject-out counterpart of  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}$ , say  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}^{[-i]}$ , can now be expressed as  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{(s),i}^{[-i]} = \mathbf{f}_{(s),i}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]})$ , where  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  is the solution of  $\mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)} \mid \mathcal{D}_{[-i]}) = 0_{q_s \times 1}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[-i]} = \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_i$ . We refer to  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  as the conventional leave-one/subject-out estimator. The procedure is repeated for  $n \times S$  times to obtain the conventional  $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathbf{w})$ , which is typically a time consuming task when the expression of  $\mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\cdot \mid \cdot)$  is complicated.

Now we develop a fast algorithm to overcome the computational bottleneck. To save notations, we suppress the use of  $\mathcal{D}$  or  $\mathcal{D}_{[-i]}$  in the estimating equations and denote  $\mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)} \mid \mathcal{D}) = \mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})$  and  $\mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)} \mid \mathcal{D}_{[-i]}) = \mathbf{U}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})$ , respectively. Moreover, we denote  $\mathbf{u}_{(s),i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}) = \mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}) - \mathbf{U}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})$ . In the remaining part of the current study, we assume that the up to third order partial derivatives of  $\mathbf{U}(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})$  are continuous functions of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}$  for each  $s$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}_{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}) &= -\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}^\top}, \quad \mathbf{J}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}) = -\frac{\partial \mathbf{U}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}^\top}, \\ \mathbf{H}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}) &= \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{J}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})}{\partial \theta_{(s),1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial \mathbf{J}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})}{\partial \theta_{(s),q_s}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbf{V}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)}) = \left\{ \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})}{\partial \theta_{(s),1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(s)})}{\partial \theta_{(s),q_s}} \right\}.$$

Now, by the definition of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  and expanding  $\mathbf{U}_{(s),[-i]}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]})$  around  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}$  up to the third-order, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0}_{q_s \times 1} &= \mathbf{U}_{(s),[-i]}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}) \\ &= \mathbf{U}_{(s)}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) - \mathbf{u}_{(s),i}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) + \mathbf{J}_{(s),[-i]}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}) - \frac{\mathbf{H}_{(s),[-i]}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})}{2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]})^{\otimes 2} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbf{V}_{(s),[-i]}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})}{6}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]})^{\otimes 3} \\ &= -\mathbf{u}_{(s),i}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) + \mathbf{J}_{(s),[-i]}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}) - \frac{\mathbf{H}_{(s),[-i]}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})}{2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]})^{\otimes 2} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{\mathbf{V}_{(s),[-i]}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})}{6} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]})^{\otimes 3},$$

where  $\mathbf{v}^{\otimes k} = \underbrace{\mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}}_{k \text{ terms}}$  for any generic vector  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}$  lies on the line segment joining  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$ . Then, after dropping the remainder term, we obtain the following estimating equation for solving the approximated leave-one/subject-out estimator:

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}_{(s),i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s) = -\mathbf{u}_{(s),i}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) + \mathbf{J}_{(s),[-i]}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_s) - \frac{\mathbf{H}_{(s),[-i]}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})}{2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_s)^{\otimes 2}. \quad (10)$$

Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s) = \mathbf{J}_{(s),[-i]}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) - \mathbf{H}_{(s),[-i]}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) \left\{ \mathbf{I}_{q_s} \otimes (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_s) \right\}$ . It is readily seen that  $\partial \boldsymbol{\psi}_{(s),i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_s^\top = -\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s)$ . The corresponding Newton-Raphson iterative algorithm for solving  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{(s),i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s) = \mathbf{0}_{q_s \times 1}$  is given by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}^{(d+1)} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}^{(d)} + \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{(s),[-i]}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}^{(d)}) \boldsymbol{\psi}_{(s),i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}^{(d)})$ , for  $d = 0, 1, \dots$  and we set the starting value as  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}^{(0)} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}$ . In practice, to avoid taking matrix inverse in each step of iteration, following Equation (4.58) of Jiang (2007), we adopt a second-order matrix approximation to further boost the algorithm, i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{(s),[-i]}^{-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}^{(d)}) \approx \mathbf{J}_{(s)}^{-1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) + \mathbf{J}_{(s)}^{-1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) \left\{ \mathbf{J}_{(s)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}) - \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_{(s),[-i]}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}^{(d)}) \right\} \mathbf{J}_{(s)}^{-1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})$ . In general, solving  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{(s),i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s) = \mathbf{0}_{q_s \times 1}$  is much easier than solving  $\mathbf{U}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s) = \mathbf{0}_{q_s \times 1}$ . First, the former is a linear-quadratic equation system, and the latter is a general nonlinear equation system, which is typically complicated in the examples considered in the current study. Second, by adopting  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{(s),i}(\cdot)$ , we avoid involving  $\mathcal{D}_{[-i]}$  directly. Instead, we need just to update the estimates based on the information embedded in  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)}$ ,  $\mathbf{J}_{(s),[-i]}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})$ ,  $\mathbf{H}_{(s),[-i]}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{(s),i}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s)})$ , which are readily available when the algorithm starts.

Let  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  be the solution of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{(s),i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s) = \mathbf{0}_{q_s \times 1}$ . In principle,  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{(s),i}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s)$  approximates  $\mathbf{U}_{(s),[-i]}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s)$  up to the second-order, and thus we term  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  as the SEcond-order-Approximated Leave-one/subject-out (SEAL) estimator and it is also expected to yield promising approximation to its conventional counterpart  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$ . This conjecture is verified in Theorem S.1 of the Supplementary Materials. In Theorem S.1, in terms of  $l_{2k}$  norm ( $l_k$  norm of a general random variable  $z$  refers to  $\mathbb{E}^{1/k}|z|^k$ ), Equation (S.2) indicates that the difference between  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  is at most of order  $O(q_s^{3/2}/n^2)$  and the result in

Equation (S.3) implies that if a further smoothness condition is imposed, we can improve this difference to order  $O(q_s^{5/2}/n^3)$ .

## 5.2 MACV based on the SEAL estimator

The SEAL estimator  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  leads to promising approximation to  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]}$  and is computationally efficient, which allows us to design a computationally attractive weight choice criterion based on it. Now consider a SEAL based weight choice criterion  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_n(\mathbf{w}) = -2 \sum_{i=1}^n Q \left\{ \mathbf{Y}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i,[-i]}(\mathbf{w}) \right\}$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i,[-i]}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{s=1}^S w_s \mathbf{f}_{(s),i}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{(s),[-i]})$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_n(\mathbf{w})$ . The convergence properties of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_n(\mathbf{w})/n$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$  are investigated in Corollary S.1 of the Supplementary Materials. This corollary indicates that the weight choice criterion evaluated at SEAL method has exactly the same limiting properties as that under conventional leave-subject/one-out method. We now study the asymptotic optimality and consistency of  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ .

### **Corollary 1 (Asymptotic optimality under divergent $S$ with SEAL estimator).**

*Assume that  $S^{1/4}\{\bar{q}^{1/2}n^{1/2}/\xi_n + n/(b_n\xi_n)\} = o(1)$ ,  $\{\log \log(n_\alpha) + \log(n/\xi_n)\}Sn^2/(n_\alpha\xi_n^2) = o(1)$ ,  $\{\log \log(n_\alpha) + \log(n/\xi_n)\}S^{5/4}n/(n_\alpha^{3/4}\xi_n) = o(1)$ ,  $n/(Sn_\alpha^2) = o(1)$  and  $\nu_n/\xi_n = o(1)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Under Assumptions S.2 and S.5–S.8 of the Supplementary Materials, for each  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ , assume that  $z_i(\mathbf{w})$ 's satisfy the mixing condition given in (S.5), we have, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$   $R_n(\tilde{\mathbf{w}})/\inf_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}} R_n(\mathbf{w}) \rightarrow 1$ , in probability.*

The proof of Corollary 1 is provided in Section S.2.9 of the Supplemental Materials. In this corollary, we impose some requirements regarding the relationships between  $\xi_n$ ,  $n$ ,  $S$  and  $\bar{q}$ , which can be viewed as a specific case of Assumption S.4 when  $a_n = n^{1/2}/\bar{q}^{1/2}$ . Corollary 1 indicates that the weight determined by SEAL based weight choice criterion is also asymptotically optimal.

### **Corollary 2 (Consistency of $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ in identifying the exactly correct models).**

*Assumption 5 and Assumptions S.2, S.5–S.8 of the Supplementary Materials are satisfied,*

and for each  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$ ,  $z_i(\mathbf{w})$ 's satisfy the mixing condition given in (S.5), then we have  $\sum_{s \in D} \tilde{w}_s \rightarrow 1$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\tilde{w}_s$  is the  $s$ th entry of  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}$ .

Along the same line as the proof of Theorem 3, we can prove Corollary 2 by using the uniform convergence properties established in Corollary S.1 and is omitted. Corollary 2 implies that our proposed SEAL based criterion is asymptotically equivalent to the conventional MACV in identifying the correct models when at least one of the candidate models is correctly specified in the exact sense.

## 6 Simulation studies

In this section, we conduct simulation experiments to assess the finite sample prediction accuracy of the proposed SEAL-based MACV (denoted as  $\text{MA}_{\text{SEAL}}$ ) and compare it with some competing methods. MACV based on conventional leave-subject/one-out estimator is not considered due to heavy computation cost. However, we compare the conventional method and SEAL in the case studies where the sample sizes are relatively small. To provide further information, we also consider the following quantity to measure the similarity between different candidate models,  $\hat{\gamma} = 2 \sum_{1 \leq s < s_1 \leq S} \hat{c}_{s,s_1} / \{S(S-1)(\sum_{s=1}^S \hat{\sigma}_s / S)^2\}$ , where  $\hat{c}_{s,s_1}$  is the sample covariance between the losses by the  $s$ th and  $s_1$ th candidate models and  $\hat{\sigma}_s$  is the sample standard deviation of the losses by the  $s$ th model among  $M$  replications. Similar measure was proposed in Breiman (2001) to quantify the similarity between different trees in random forest. We also consider the overall performance measure  $\bar{L}_M$ , which is the average of the losses from all the  $S$  candidate models among  $M$  replications. Further simulation studies under different data settings (GEE models with high dimensional covariates, within-cluster correlation structure modeling, conditional prediction in spatial data, and quantile regression with a potential correlation structure) are reported in Sections S.4.1. The power of MACV in identifying the exactly correct models is also assessed

via simulation in Section S.4.2.

**Design 1** (Longitudinal data with discrete responses). The purpose of the current simulation study is to assess the performance of the proposed  $MA_{SEAL}$  in predicting discrete longitudinal data. We employ GEE to conduct parameter estimation via MATLAB toolbox GEEQBOX (Ratcliffe and Shults, 2008) and compare  $MA_{SEAL}$  with its competitors when all the candidate GEEs are misspecified (specially, the marginal mean function). We examine the following competing methods: model averaging with equal weights (denoted as Equal), model selection methods based on CV (denoted by CV, which is also based on SEAL estimator), the quasi-likelihood under the independence model criterion (QIC) of Pan (2001) (denoted by  $QIC_{Pan}$ ) and modified QIC by Imori (2015) (denoted by  $QIC_{Imori}$ ). The data are generated by the algorithm based on the conditional linear family (Qaqish, 2003). The binary responses  $Y_{ij}$ 's ( $i = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, \dots, 4$ ) have the marginal mean of form  $p_{ij} = 1 / \{1 + \exp(-\mathbf{x}_{ij}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})\}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{ij} = (1, x_{ij,1}, \dots, x_{ij,p})^\top$ ,  $x_{ij,k}$ 's ( $k = 1, \dots, p$ ) are independent and identically distributed as  $\text{Normal}(0, 1)$ .  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  takes value from  $\{(0.2, 0, 0, 0, -0.5, 0.1)^\top, (0.2, 0, 0, 0, -0.5, 0.3, -0.1), (0.2, 0, 0, 0, 0, -0.5, 0.3, -0.1)^\top\}$  for  $n = \{100, 150, 200\}$ , respectively. Moreover, we set  $\text{corr}(Y_{ij}, Y_{il}) = \rho^{|j-l|}$  with  $\rho \in \{0, 0.3\}$ , where we set the largest value of  $\rho$  as 0.3 to guarantee the natural restriction condition (Qaqish, 2003). Here,  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ 's are set to be independent for different  $i$  and the true within subject correlation structure is “independent structure” or “first-order autoregressive correlation matrix”, depending on the value of  $\rho$ . In the candidate GEEs, the logit-link function is adopted. For the configuration of linear predictors in candidate GEEs, the constant term is always included, and  $x_{ij,k}$ 's ( $k = 1, \dots, p - 1$ ) are optional covariates that may or may not be included in the linear predictor. The last covariate  $x_{ij,p}$  is deliberately dropped from all the candidate models so that the mean functions in all the candidate GEEs are misspecified. Two types of working correlation structures are involved, i.e., “equicorrelated structure” and “first-order autoregressive working correlation matrix” and this configuration allows us



to mimic the situation where the working correlation structures are subjected to possible misspecification. Therefore, we have  $2 \times 2^{p-1}$  candidate models and all of them are misspecified. Under the current setup, there are at least two models contain the same number of unknown parameters, therefore the notion of the full-model becomes ambiguous. This is another reason that motivates us to consider model averaging in the current scenario. The loss function defined in Equation (3) is employed to assess the prediction accuracy of different methods. Correlated counts  $Y_{ij}$ 's are also generated, where  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{ij}) = \exp(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})$  and log-link function is adopted. The loss function in Equation (4) is considered. Other configurations are same as those in the binary data.

In each parameter setting,  $M = 1000$  replications are generated. Sample-based mean and 25%, 50% and 75% quantiles of scaled losses (scaled by  $10 \times n^{-1}$ ) for different methods under various combinations of sample sizes and  $\rho$  are reported in Table 1, together with  $S$ ,  $\hat{\gamma}$  and  $\bar{L}_M$ . It is observed that in terms of sample-based mean, 50% and 75% quantiles of the losses, the proposed model averaging method consistently outperforms its competitors in all the settings. As for 25% quantiles of the losses, all methods perform closely. Moreover, CV,  $\text{QIC}_{\text{Imori}}$ , and  $\text{QIC}_{\text{Pan}}$  lead to very similar performances when the sample size becomes larger. Equal weight model averaging leads to the worst performance, which is probably due to the reason that the strategy puts equal weight on all the models and thus tends to be impacted by models with very large losses. In fact, under the scenario of binary responses, all the  $\bar{L}_M$ 's are larger than 0.37, which is at least four times larger than the average loss of the best method. Whereas for the scenario of count data,  $\bar{L}_M$ 's are at least eight times larger than the average loss of the best method. These observations indicate the presence of very poor models. We also find that in comparison to model selection, the advantage of  $\text{MA}_{\text{SEAL}}$  is more pronounced when  $\hat{\gamma}$  remains at a lower level (e.g., when  $\rho = 0$ ). The reason is that if all the candidate models have similar performances, it is relatively easier for the model selection criterion to identify the best models.

Table 1: Results for Design 1: sample-based mean, 25%, 50% and 75% quantiles of scaled loss (scaled by  $10 \times n^{-1}$ ) by different methods

		Correlated binary data											
$n$	$S$	$\rho = 0.3$					$\rho = 0$						
		MA <sub>SEAL</sub>	Equal	CV	QIC <sub>Imori</sub>	QIC <sub>Pan</sub>	MA <sub>SEAL</sub>	Equal	CV	QIC <sub>Imori</sub>	QIC <sub>Pan</sub>		
100	32	mean	0.112	0.221	0.122	0.122	0.123	0.099	0.211	0.114	0.115	0.115	
		25%	0.057	0.173	0.056	0.055	0.058	0.050	0.163	0.047	0.048	0.049	
		50%	0.094	0.210	0.105	0.101	0.104	0.080	0.204	0.094	0.096	0.095	
		75%	0.149	0.259	0.167	0.166	0.168	0.126	0.247	0.154	0.154	0.155	
		$\hat{\gamma}$						0.669					
	$\bar{L}_M$						0.373						
	150	64	mean	0.100	0.263	0.103	0.104	0.104	0.094	0.256	0.101	0.102	0.102
			25%	0.057	0.222	0.057	0.055	0.058	0.054	0.215	0.052	0.053	0.053
			50%	0.086	0.256	0.089	0.088	0.090	0.080	0.251	0.085	0.086	0.088
			75%	0.129	0.301	0.134	0.134	0.134	0.118	0.293	0.134	0.135	0.135
$\hat{\gamma}$								0.653					
200	128	$\bar{L}_M$						0.462					
		mean	0.088	0.260	0.094	0.093	0.094	0.081	0.252	0.090	0.091	0.091	
		25%	0.053	0.223	0.054	0.054	0.055	0.049	0.219	0.048	0.049	0.049	
		50%	0.078	0.257	0.084	0.082	0.085	0.069	0.249	0.079	0.079	0.079	
		75%	0.111	0.292	0.122	0.121	0.123	0.100	0.282	0.118	0.119	0.119	
							0.644						
							0.455						
		Correlated count data											
100	32	mean	0.222	0.980	0.234	0.234	0.235	0.207	0.966	0.223	0.225	0.225	
		25%	0.165	0.881	0.169	0.166	0.170	0.160	0.870	0.160	0.163	0.162	
		50%	0.201	0.974	0.213	0.212	0.214	0.188	0.961	0.204	0.206	0.208	
		75%	0.257	1.070	0.278	0.279	0.278	0.235	1.057	0.264	0.267	0.267	
		$\hat{\gamma}$						0.650					
	150	64	$\bar{L}_M$						1.804				
			mean	0.220	1.447	0.225	0.225	0.225	0.210	1.434	0.218	0.219	0.219
			25%	0.177	1.340	0.177	0.177	0.178	0.171	1.334	0.173	0.174	0.173
			50%	0.206	1.442	0.214	0.213	0.214	0.198	1.432	0.206	0.207	0.207
			75%	0.253	1.542	0.257	0.259	0.258	0.235	1.530	0.249	0.251	0.252
							0.663						
200	128	$\bar{L}_M$						2.765					
		mean	0.213	1.433	0.219	0.220	0.220	0.203	1.405	0.213	0.214	0.214	
		25%	0.180	1.348	0.181	0.181	0.181	0.175	1.327	0.178	0.178	0.178	
		50%	0.202	1.429	0.207	0.208	0.207	0.194	1.404	0.204	0.205	0.205	
		75%	0.235	1.519	0.245	0.246	0.245	0.221	1.479	0.239	0.239	0.240	
							0.636						
							2.635						

## 7 Case study

In this section, we apply MACV (both conventional and MA<sub>SEAL</sub>) to analyze a dataset from a respiratory study (Davis, 1991). The trial of respiratory study involved  $n = 111$  participants (subjects) and each subject has five observations (month 0, month 1, . . . , month 4). Following Everitt and Hothorn (2010), we take the status for month 0 as baseline status and use it as a covariate. Thus the rearranged data have 4 observations for each subject.

The response variable is the status of subject (good = 1, poor = 0). Due to the response variable’s binary nature, GEE with the logit-link is applied to fit the data. Moreover, a constant term is always included in the linear predictor of all the candidate GEEs. Other optional covariates are Center (center 1 = 0, center 2 = 1), Treat (treatment = 1, placebo = 0), Sex (male = 1, female = 0), Baseline (good = 1, poor = 0) and Age. These optional covariates may or may not be included in the candidate GEEs. We also consider two working correlation structures, i.e., “equicorrelated structure” and “first-order autoregressive working correlation matrix”. Therefore, we have  $S = 2 \times 2^5 = 64$  candidate models. To assess the performance of the proposed MACV method and its competitors (CV, QIC<sub>Imori</sub> and QIC<sub>Pan</sub>) in predicting the new subjects, we randomly group the full dataset into training dataset and test set and repeat this process for  $M = 1000$  times. The proportion of test set  $r_{\text{test}}$  takes value 0.7 or 0.3.  $n_{\text{test}} = \text{floor}(n \times r_{\text{test}})$  is the number of subjects in the test set. Parameter estimation and model averaging (or selection) are based on training data. Stimulated by the loss function given in (3), in the  $m$ th replication ( $m = 1, \dots, 1000$ ), we employ the following scaled empirical loss to measure the prediction accuracy of a method.

$$\widehat{L}^{(m)} = -\frac{2}{n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{j=1}^4 \left\{ Y_{ij,\text{test}}^{(m)} \log \left( \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{ij,\text{train}}^{(m)}}{1 - \widehat{\mu}_{ij,\text{train}}^{(m)}} \right) + \log(1 - \widehat{\mu}_{ij,\text{train}}^{(m)}) \right\} - \widehat{L}_*^{(m)},$$

where  $Y_{ij,\text{test}}^{(m)}$  is the binary status of the  $j$ th observation of the  $i$ th subject in the test data,  $\widehat{\mu}_{ij,\text{train}}^{(m)}$  is the prediction of  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{ij,\text{test}}^{(m)})$  by different methods (MACV, CV, QIC<sub>Imori</sub> or QIC<sub>Pan</sub>)

based on the training data, and

$$\widehat{L}_*^{(m)} = \min_{1 \leq s \leq S} \left[ -\frac{2}{n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{j=1}^4 \left\{ Y_{ij,\text{test}}^{(m)} \log \left( \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{(s),ij,\text{train}}^{(m)}}{1 - \widehat{\mu}_{(s),ij,\text{train}}^{(m)}} \right) + \log(1 - \widehat{\mu}_{(s),ij,\text{train}}^{(m)}) \right\} \right],$$

with  $\widehat{\mu}_{(s),ij,\text{train}}^{(m)}$  being the prediction of  $\mathbb{E}(y_{ij,\text{test}}^{(m)})$  by the  $s$ th candidate GEE. The empirical loss  $\widehat{L}_{(m)}$  finds its root in Akaike information or relative Kullback-Leibler divergence, and we can use it to measure the divergence between the future data (test data) and predictions based on training data. A similar measure has also been advocated by Zhang et al. (2016) and Yu et al. (2018).

Sample-based mean, 25%, 50% and 75% quantiles of  $\widehat{L}_{(m)}$ 's ( $m = 1, \dots, 1000$ ) are reported in Table 2, where we also report the computing time (seconds) of MA<sub>SEAL</sub> and conventional MACV (denoted by MA<sub>CONV</sub>). It is observed that in terms of prediction loss, MA<sub>SEAL</sub> and conventional MACV yield almost identical performance, while MA<sub>SEAL</sub> costs much shorter computing time. It can also be observed from Table 2 that when the sample size of training data is smaller ( $r_{\text{test}} = 0.7$ ), MA<sub>SEAL</sub> and conventional MACV methods substantially outperform their competing methods (Equal, CV, QIC<sub>Imori</sub> and QIC<sub>Pan</sub>). Moreover, when the sample size in the training data becomes larger ( $r_{\text{test}} = 0.3$ ), the situation becomes slightly mixed. The  $\widehat{L}_{(m)}$ 's ( $m = 1, \dots, 1000$ ) by MACV method have the smallest sample mean, median and 75% quantile, whereas those by QIC<sub>Imori</sub> have the smallest 25% quantile. One possible explanation of this phenomenon is that when the sample size is smaller, the model selection procedure induces a higher level of sampling error to the post-model-selection-prediction, and such an error can be reduced by MACV method, by integrating the predictions from different candidate models. When the sample size becomes larger, such sampling error caused by model selection becomes smaller and poses a less severe impact on prediction. These findings further support the use of our MACV method in practical situations. It can also be observed that when the training sample size increases from 33 (i.e.,  $r_{\text{test}} = 0.7$ ) to 77 (i.e.,  $r_{\text{test}} = 0.3$ ), the computing time of SEAL

estimator only increases by 22%, whereas that of conventional leave-subject-out estimator increases for about 155%, demonstrating the computational efficiency of SEAL in practice.

We also analyze the epilepsy seizure count data, neighborhood crimes data and airline data in Section Section S.4.3 of the Supplemental Materials. These case studies further verify the advantage of the proposed MACV over its competitors and demonstrate the computational efficiency of SEAL in practical situations.

Table 2: Results for the respiratory study: sample based mean and 25%, 50% and 75% quantiles of  $\widehat{L}_{(m)}$ 's ( $m = 1, \dots, 1000$ ) and computing time (seconds) by different methods,

$r_{\text{test}} \in \{0.7, 0.3\}$

	$r_{\text{test}} = 0.7$						$r_{\text{test}} = 0.3$					
	MA <sub>SEAL</sub>	MA <sub>CONV</sub>	Equal	CV	QIC <sub>Imori</sub>	QIC <sub>Pan</sub>	MA <sub>SEAL</sub>	MA <sub>CONV</sub>	Equal	CV	QIC <sub>Imori</sub>	QIC <sub>Pan</sub>
mean	0.237	0.238	0.249	0.479	0.502	0.511	0.196	0.196	0.340	0.233	0.228	0.239
25%	0.066	0.066	0.122	0.069	0.097	0.091	0.094	0.094	0.179	0.105	0.067	0.098
50%	0.175	0.175	0.259	0.210	0.255	0.268	0.164	0.164	0.355	0.168	0.165	0.173
75%	0.317	0.317	0.391	0.486	0.529	0.566	0.252	0.253	0.496	0.286	0.317	0.303
Time	1837.14	5996.49	–	–	–	–	2241.29	15284.27	–	–	–	–

## 8 Discussions

In this paper, we have proposed a model averaging method in a unified framework based on CV. The new unified framework is flexible for different types of data and broad loss functions. Within this framework, we exemplify four new optimal model averaging estimators under four important situations, i.e., longitudinal data with discrete responses, within-cluster correlation structure modeling, conditional prediction in spatial data, and quantile regression with a potential correlation structure. We also propose SEAL to reduce the computational burden. The unified framework covers many existing model averaging estimators such as jackknife model averaging for linear models (Hansen and Racine, 2012; Zhang et al., 2013), longitudinal data models (Gao et al., 2016), generalized additive partial linear models (Chen et al., 2023) and quantile regression (Lu and Su, 2015;

Wang et al., 2023). The proposed MACV enjoys excellent theoretical properties. Simulation and cases studies showed that the MACV has promising finite sample performance under different situations. The technique used in the theoretical development and analysis is flexible to different data structures, loss functions, and estimation methods. Thus we expect that our method can be potentially applied in the areas of complex data analysis such as high-dimensional smoothed quantile regression (Tan et al., 2022) and generalized additive model with penalized spline (Hui et al., 2019) and so on.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Co-Editor, Professor Annie Qu, an associate editor, and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive suggestions and comments, which substantially improved the earlier version of this article.

## References

- Ando, T. and Li, K.-C. (2014), “A model-averaging approach for high-dimensional regression,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109, 254–265.
- Bartlett, P., Jordan, M., and McAulie, J. (2006), “Convexity, classification, and risk bounds,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101, 138–156.
- Breiman, L. (2001), “Random forests,” *Machine Learning*, 45, 5–32.
- Chen, Z., Liao, J., Xu, W., and Yang, Y. (2023), “Multifold cross-validation model averaging for generalized additive partial linear models,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 32, 1649–1659.
- Christoffersen, P. and Jacobs, K. (2004), “The importance of the loss function in option valuation,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 72, 291–318.

- Davis, C. S. (1991), “Semi-parametric and non-parametric methods for the analysis of repeated measurements with applications to clinical trials,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 10, 1959–1980.
- Debruyne, M., Hubert, M., and Suykens, J. (2008), “Model selection in kernel based regression using the influence function,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9, 2377–2400.
- Everitt, B. and Hothorn, T. (2010), *A Handbook of Statistical Analyses Using R*, Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2nd ed.
- Feng, Y., Liu, Q., Yao, Q., and Zhao, G. (2021), “Model averaging for nonlinear regression models,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 40, 785–798.
- Flynn, C. J., Hurvich, C. M., and Simonoff, J. S. (2013), “Efficiency for regularization parameter selection in penalized likelihood estimation of misspecified models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108, 1031–1043.
- Gao, Y., Zhang, X., Wang, S., and Zou, G. (2016), “Model averaging based on leave-subject-out cross-validation,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 192, 139–151.
- Gospodinov, N. and Maasoumi, E. (2021), “Generalized aggregation of misspecified models: With an application to asset pricing,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 222, 451–467.
- Hansen, B. E. (2007), “Least squares model averaging,” *Econometrica*, 75, 1175–1189.
- Hansen, B. E. and Racine, J. (2012), “Jackknife model averaging,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 167, 38–46.
- Horn, R. and Johnson, C. (1990), *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hui, F., Shang, Y., and Müller, S. (2019), “Semiparametric regression using variational approximations,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114, 1765–1777.

- Imori, S. (2015), “Model selection criterion based on the multivariate quasi-likelihood for generalized estimating equations,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 42, 1214–1224.
- Jiang, J. (2007), *Linear and Generalized Linear Mixed Models and Their Applications*, Berlin: Springer.
- Koenker, R. and Bassett, G. (1978), “Regression quantiles,” *Econometrica*, 46, 33–50.
- Konishi, S. and Kitagawa, G. (2007), *Information Criteria and Statistical Modeling*, New York: Springer.
- Krueger, T., Panknin, D., and Braun, M. (2015), “Fast cross-validation via sequential testing,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16, 1103–1155.
- Lee, L.-F. (2002), “Consistency and efficiency of least squares estimation for mixed regressive, spatial autoregressive models,” *Econometric Theory*, 18, 252–277.
- (2004), “Asymptotic distributions of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators for spatial autoregressive models,” *Econometrica*, 72, 1899–1925.
- Li, C., Yuan, X., Lin, C., Guo, M., Wu, W., Yan, J., and Ouyang, W. (2019), “Am-  
lfs: Automl for loss function search,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 8410–8419.
- Liang, H., Zou, G., Wan, A. T. K., and Zhang, X. (2011), “Optimal weight choice for frequentist model average estimators,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106, 1053–1066.
- Liang, K.-Y. and Zeger, S. (1986), “Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models,” *Biometrika*, 73, 13–22.



- Liu, Q., Yao, Q., and Zhao, G. (2020a), “Model averaging estimation for conditional volatility models with an application to stock market volatility forecast,” *Journal of Forecasting*, 39, 841–863.
- Liu, Y., Liao, S., Jiang, S., Ding, L., Lin, H., and Wang, W. (2020b), “Fast Cross-Validation for Kernel-Based Algorithms,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 42, 1083–1096.
- Lu, X. and Su, L. (2015), “Jackknife model averaging for quantile regressions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 188, 40–58.
- Lv, J. and Liu, J. S. (2014), “Model selection principles in misspecified models,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 76, 141–167.
- Martellosio, F. and Hillier, G. (2020), “Adjusted QMLE for the spatial autoregressive parameter,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 219, 488–506.
- Merlevede, F., Peligrad, M., and Rio, E. (2009), “Bernstein inequality and moderate deviations under strong mixing conditions,” in *High dimensional probability V: the Luminy volume*, Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Modha, D. and Masry, E. (1996), “Minimum complexity regression estimation with weakly dependent observations,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 42, 2133–2145.
- Newey, W. (1991), “Uniform convergence in probability and stochastic equicontinuity,” *Econometrica*, 59, 1161–1167.
- Pan, W. (2001), “Akaike’s information criterion in generalized estimating equations,” *Biometrics*, 57, 529–534.
- Peng, J. and Yang, Y. (2022), “On improvability of model selection by model averaging,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 229, 246–262.

- Qaqish, B. F. (2003), “A family of multivariate binary distributions for simulating correlated binary variables,” *Biometrika*, 90, 455–463.
- Qu, A. and Lindsay, B. G. (2003), “Building adaptive estimating equations when inverse of covariance estimation is difficult,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 65, 127–142.
- Qu, A., Lindsay, B. G., and Li, B. (2000), “Improving generalised estimating equations using quadratic inference functions,” *Biometrika*, 87, 823–836.
- Racine, J., Li, Q., Yu, D., and Zheng, L. (2023), “Optimal model averaging of mixed-data kernel-weighted spline regressions,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 41, 1251–1261.
- Ratcliffe, S. and Shults, J. (2008), “GEEQBOX: a MATLAB toolbox for generalized estimating equations and quasi-least squares,” *Journal of Statistical Software*, 25, 1–14.
- Severini, T. A. and Staniswalis, J. G. (1994), “Quasi-likelihood estimation in semiparametric models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89, 501–511.
- Tan, K., Wang, L., and Zhou, W.-X. (2022), “High-dimensional quantile regression convolution smoothing and concave regularization,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 84, 205–233.
- Tian, Y. and Feng, Y. (2023), “Transfer learning under high-dimensional generalized linear models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118, 2684–2697.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (2000), *Asymptotic statistics*, Cambridge University Press.
- Wan, A. T. K., Zhang, X., and Zou, G. (2010), “Least squares model averaging by Mallows criterion,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 156, 277–283.

- Wang, L. (2011), “GEE analysis of clustered binary data with diverging number of covariates,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 39, 389–417.
- Wang, M., Zhang, X., Wan, A. T. K., You, K., and Zou, G. (2023), “Jackknife model averaging for high-dimensional quantile regression,” *Biometrics*, 79, 178–189.
- White, H. (1982), “Maximum likelihood estimation of misspecified models,” *Econometrica*, 50, 1–25.
- Yu, D., Bai, P., and Ding, C. (2015), “Adjusted quasi-maximum likelihood estimator for mixed regressive, spatial autoregressive model and its small sample bias,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 87, 116–135.
- Yu, D., Zhang, X., and Yau, K. (2018), “Asymptotic properties and information criteria for misspecified generalized linear mixed models,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 80, 817–836.
- Zhang, X., Wan, A. T. K., and Zou, G. (2013), “Model averaging by jackknife criterion in models with dependent data,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 174, 82–94.
- Zhang, X., Yu, D., Zou, G., and Liang, H. (2016), “Optimal model averaging estimation for generalized linear models and generalized linear mixed-effects models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111, 1775–1790.
- Zhang, X., Zou, G., Liang, H., and Carroll, R. J. (2020), “Parsimonious model averaging with a diverging number of parameters,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115, 972–984.
- Zhou, J. and Qu, A. (2012), “Informative estimation and selection of correlation structure for longitudinal data,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107, 701–710.