

Testing linearity of spatial interaction functions à la Ramsey*

Abhimanyu Gupta [†] Jungyoon Lee [‡] Francesca Rossi [§]

December 20, 2024

Abstract

We propose a computationally straightforward test for the linearity of a spatial interaction function. Such functions arise commonly, either as practitioner imposed specifications or due to optimizing behaviour by agents. Our test is nonparametric, but based on the Lagrange Multiplier principle and reminiscent of the Ramsey RESET approach. This entails estimation only under the null hypothesis, which yields an easy to estimate linear spatial autoregressive model. Monte Carlo simulations show excellent size control and power. An empirical study with Finnish data illustrates the test's practical usefulness, shedding light on debates on the presence of tax competition among neighbouring municipalities.

Keywords: Spatial autoregression, Series expansion, Specification testing, Nonparametric.

JEL Classification: C31, C14.

*This paper is dedicated to the memory of Francesca Rossi. We are grateful to seminar participants at Princeton, Aarhus, Cambridge, Queen Mary, RCEA, Warwick Econometrics Workshop, National University of Singapore, EcoSta and the Midwest Econometrics Group 2024, as well as Sílvia Gonçalves and Mikkel Sølvsten, for comments and feedback. Abhimanyu Gupta's research was supported by the Leverhulme Trust via grant RPG-2024-038.

[†]Department of Economics, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK. Email: a.gupta@essex.ac.uk

[‡]Department of Economics, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, TW20 0EX, UK. Email: jungyoon.lee@rhul.ac.uk

[§]Department of Economics, University of Verona, via Cantarane 24, 37129, Verona, Italy. Email: francesca.rossi_02@univr.it.

1 Introduction

There has been a recent surge in the study of econometric models capturing social interactions between agents, see e.g. de Paula (2017) for a survey. By virtue of its close links to network and social interaction models, the spatial econometrics literature has also grown commensurately. A key component of this literature is the linear spatial autoregressive (SAR) model, introduced by Cliff and Ord (1968, 1973). The ‘spatial’ moniker is unfortunate in some sense because it belies the generality of the SAR model. In fact the ‘space’ in question can be any economic dimension that connects individuals, e.g. social networks and conflict alliances. In this paper we propose and theoretically justify a convenient nonparametric test for the linearity of the SAR specification, which is by far the most prevalent in the literature.

The assumption of linearity in the preponderance of studies involving SAR models is perhaps unsurprising given that even in straightforward multiple regression the linear model wins the popularity contest. Nevertheless, linearity is a strong assumption, criticized by Pinkse and Slade (2010) for instance, and discussed in detail in de Paula (2017), Section 3.2. In the case of spatial autoregressions, nonlinearity in the spatial lag also induces immense technical difficulties due to the simultaneity inherent in the model. This has led to the seminal development of sophisticated machinery (Jenish and Prucha, 2009, 2012) to handle such ‘nonlinear spatial dynamics’, but the flipside is that the conditions tend to be technically challenging and restricted to geographic data.

The econometric implications of nonlinearity in spatial or network interactions are manifold. The focus of this paper is to test for potential nonlinearity in the so called ‘link’ function, which transmits a network connection-weighted average of peer outcomes to an individual’s own outcome. Tincani (2018) finds evidence of nonlinearities in education peer effects in Chile, the link function here operating on the distribution of peer outcomes. Other implications of nonlinearities can include multiple equilibria, or potentially none at all. We refer the reader to detailed discussions of various forms of nonlinearity and their implications in, for example, Blume et al. (2011) and de Paula (2017) .

While of importance in its own econometric right, and possibly in a reduced form sense, testing for the linearity of a SAR specification can also address deeper economic considerations. Many network games yield equilibria with linear best responses and, when taken to the data, imply linear SAR specifications. Thus, a rejection of the linearity of the SAR specification can in fact be viewed as a rejection of the underlying structural economic model. Examples of such models include contest success functions (CSFs) in the Tullock (1980) style (König et al., 2017), quadratic utility network games (Ballester et al., 2006; Calvó-Armengol et al., 2009) and public goods provision games in networks (Bramoullé and Kranton, 2007). These are discussed in more detail in the next

section.

Nonlinearity of best responses in network games can have profound economic implications. Acemoglu et al. (2016) emphasize that convexity or concavity of nonlinear network interactions can shape how the underlying network transmits shocks. Most strikingly, they show that with concave interactions, densely connected economies outperform sparser ones in the sense of expected macroeconomic outcomes. Indeed, an economy in which interlinkages are maximally dense outperforms all other (symmetric) economies. On the contrary, with convex interactions this pattern is completely reversed, with the maximally dense economy being the worst performing. The finding that concavity of interactions acts as a ‘shock absorber’ while convexity turns this into a ‘shockwave propagator’ aligns with the groundbreaking work of Allen and Gale (2000) on financial contagion. Thus, if a theoretical structural model begets a linear best response equilibrium, it behooves the economist to have some statistical confidence in the resulting empirical model.

We employ a residual based test statistic reminiscent of the Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test to avoid nonparametric estimation altogether. The basic idea is to approximate the potentially nonlinear part of the model with a sieve expansion of length p . By choosing a basis of polynomial components, a test of linearity may be constructed by setting as zero all coefficients except the one corresponding to the linear term. This is an approach in the spirit of the famous Ramsey RESET test. Because we employ the LM principle, we need only estimate the model under the null hypothesis, which is the familiar linear SAR model.

Because p is a diverging nonparametric bandwidth, the number of coefficients on nonlinear terms must grow with sample size. Therefore our test will be for an increasing number of restrictions $p \rightarrow \infty$ asymptotically, and the usual χ_p^2 asymptotic distribution cannot be relied upon. To address this, we will use a centred and scaled version of the statistic. In particular our test statistic will be of the form $(\mathcal{T}_p - p)/\sqrt{2p}$, where \mathcal{T}_p is computable by estimating the model under the null of linearity. We will show that this is asymptotically standard normal under the null, noting that a χ_p^2 random variable has mean p and variance $2p$, in the spirit of de Jong and Bierens (1994), Hong and White (1995), Donald et al. (2003) and Gupta and Seo (2023), to cite a few examples. We also establish the test’s consistency and ability to detect local alternatives at a suitably dampened nonparametric rate.

There are several specification tests in the literature for linearity of the regression function in a linear SAR model, see for instance Su and Qu (2017) and Gupta and Qu (2024). On the other hand, the cupboard is rather bare as far as tests of linearity of the spatial lag are concerned. The most direct linearity test is provided by Hoshino (2022) and relies on the nonparametric function being estimated. This is a different approach from our Ramsey-style test, which stresses simplicity. The model considered is also somewhat

different from ours: we test for linearity of the spatial lag as a whole while Hoshino (2022) focuses on testing linearity in the outcome variable. Thus, the two approaches to testing linearity complement each other. Another type of linearity test is proposed by Malikov and Sun (2017), but there the spatial parameter itself is modelled as a varying coefficient while the spatial lag is linear. This is rather different from our setup. Finally, another class of tests is of the omnibus type where model misspecification can arise from a variety of sources, see Lee et al. (2020).

In a Monte Carlo simulation study, we show that critical values based on our theory deliver excellent size and power performance for a wide variety of commonly encountered social interaction networks and spatial links. These include contiguity, nearest neighbours, distance cutoff networks and more general structures. We experiment with both standard normal critical values as well as standardized $(\chi_p^2 - p)/\sqrt{2p}$ critical values, and observe that the latter can do well with smaller values of p .

The linear SAR model is by far the most commonly employed empirical specification. In an empirical study, we study a model of tax competition and show how our test for linearity can raise new questions or indeed refine existing analysis. Our test corroborates Lyytikäinen (2012)'s finding of absence of tax competition between Finnish municipalities in their property tax setting behaviour, illustrating how different model specifications can lead to contrasting conclusions and how our test can offer insightful guidance on the specification choice.

The next section introduces our basic setup and a number of structural economic models that imply linear SAR specifications. In Section 3 we define our test statistic while Section 4 presents the key assumptions and asymptotic results. Section 5 contains the results of our Monte Carlo experiments and Section 6 presents our empirical study of tax competition in Finland. All proofs are collected in the appendix.

2 Basic setup and examples

Let W be a spatial weight matrix with rows w'_i and zero diagonal. Given an $n \times 1$ response vector y and $k \times 1$ covariate vector x_i with unity as first element, we commence from

$$y_i = \lambda w'_i y + f(w'_i y) + x'_i \beta + \epsilon_i, i = 1 \dots, n, \quad (2.1)$$

with $f(\cdot)$ being an unknown function and ϵ_i independent disturbances. The x_i can contain both exogenous and endogenous components. The first term on the RHS represents the usual linear SAR component and $f(\cdot)$ is a nonparametric function that embodies the potential non-linearity of the true data generating process.

2.1 Economic models that imply SAR structures

Apart from being an often used econometric specification, the linear SAR model is implied by a number of theoretical models. Thus an empirical test of its linearity in fact serves as test of the underlying economic structure that leads to the estimation of a SAR structure. In this sense our test can be viewed as test of economic theory, rather than simply the statistical fit of an econometric model. We discuss some examples of such theories in this section, with x_i always denoting a $k \times 1$ vector of observable characteristics for the i -th individual, and β a $k \times 1$ parameter vector.

Example 1 (*Tax Competition*). Tax competition is the setting of our empirical study in Section 6. Indeed, the literature on tax competition justifies the use of linear SAR empirical specifications by extending theoretical results of the Kanbur and Keen (1993) model of tax competition between two revenue-maximising governments in at least two ways.

The first method, see e.g. Redoano (2014) gives rise to linear tax reaction functions in an n -country setting. Households determine their purchase of goods/investment portfolio over n countries by maximizing their returns net of transaction costs that are increasing in distances. The representative household of country i , which has capital endowment of \tilde{k}_i , chooses its investment portfolio k_{ij} , $j = 1, \dots, n$, to maximize

$$\sum_{j=1}^n k_{ij}(1 - \tau_j) - \sum_{j \neq i} c(d_{ij}) \frac{k_{ij}^2}{2}$$

subject to $\sum_j k_{ij} = \tilde{k}_i$, where it is assumed that production is linear in capital, τ_j is the tax rate of country j , d_{ij} is some notion of distance between countries i and j , and $c(\cdot)$ an increasing cost function. This leads to a quadratic revenue function for governments, so that government i chooses its tax rate τ_i to maximize its total tax revenue

$$TR_i = \tau_i \left(\tilde{k}_i + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\tau_j - \tau_i}{c(d_{ij})} \right).$$

The best responses are then linear in the τ_j and given by:

$$\tau_i^* = \frac{1}{2 \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{c(d_{ij})}} \left(\tilde{k}_i + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\tau_j}{c(d_{ij})} \right), \quad (2.2)$$

leading to a linear SAR estimating equation below with a row-normalized inverse-distance

weight matrix:

$$\tau_i = \alpha_i + x_i' \beta + \lambda \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \tau_j + \epsilon_i \quad (2.3)$$

where α_i is the country fixed effect.

On the other hand, a second method proposed by Devereux et al. (2007) extends the Kanbur and Keen (1993) model to allow individual demand for the taxed good to be price-elastic. While we refer the reader to the original paper for details of the modelling strategy, the empirical model in Section 4 therein employs (2.3) using data on cigarette taxation in US states and a number of economically motivated choices for w_{ij} . Yet another theoretical model, this time of corporate tax competition between OECD countries, can be seen to yield (2.3) in Devereux et al. (2008).

Example 2 (*Conflict Networks*). König et al. (2017) bring a theoretical and empirical perspective on how a network of military alliances and enmities affects the intensity of a conflict. Their theoretical model combines network theory and politico-economic theory of conflict. Simplifying their setting for ease of exposition, for participants i and j in a conflict define the $n \times n$ adjacency matrix W^* by

$$w_{ij}^* = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \text{ and } j \text{ are allies,} \\ 0, & \text{if } i \text{ and } j \text{ are in a neutral relationship.} \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

The n participants compete for a divisible prize V , for example land or resources, and suffer a defeat cost $D \geq 0$ if they do not win a fraction of it. The payoff function maps the groups' relative fighting intensities into shares of the prize and can be interpreted as a Tullock (1980)-type contest success function. Specifically, letting \mathcal{G}^n denote the class of graphs on n nodes, the payoff $\pi : \mathcal{G}^n \times \mathfrak{R}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$ for participant i is

$$\pi_i(G, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{V \varphi_i(G, y)}{\sum_{j=1}^n \max\{0, \varphi_j(G, y)\}} - y_i, & \text{if } \varphi_i(G, y) \geq 0, \\ -D, & \text{if } \varphi_i(G, y) < 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

where $y \in \mathfrak{R}^n$ is a vector of fighting efforts and $\varphi_i(\cdot) \in \mathfrak{R}$ is participant i 's operational performance:

$$\varphi_i(G, y) = x_i' \beta + y_i + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}}(j)) w_{ij}^* y_j + \epsilon_i, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ is a linear spillover effect from allies fighting efforts, $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}}(j)$ is an indicator that takes the value 1 when participant j accepts defeat and takes the cost D , and ϵ_i is an unobserved participant characteristic. As shown in König et al. (2017), such a model yields a Nash equilibrium which implies the structural relationship (2.1) with $f(\cdot) \equiv 0$,

i.e. a linear SAR specification.

Example 3 (*Network Games with Quadratic Utility*). The model (2.1) $f(\cdot) \equiv 0$ is also implied by a class of canonical games of externalities defined by quadratic utilities, see e.g. Ballester et al. (2006); Calvó-Armengol et al. (2009). As an example, suppose a set of n agents is connected via a binary network W where $w_{ij} = 1$ if agents i and j are friends, and zero otherwise. Each agent i selects an effort level e_i and receives the payoff

$$u_i(e_i, e_{-i}, x_i, W) = e_i x_i' \beta + e_i + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} e_i e_j - \frac{e_i^2}{2}, \quad (2.7)$$

where e_{-i} denotes the effort vector of agents other than i , $\lambda \in (-1, 1)$ is the peer effect.

To understand (2.7) economically, suppose the agents are students and effort is time spent studying for a test. Then (2.7) is interpreted as agent i 's grade is determined by their own observable abilities x_i , their own effort e_i and the efforts of their friends e_{-i} which influences their own effort level via the network W .

The Nash equilibrium of this game is given by the effort levels

$$e_i^*(W) = x_i' \beta + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} e_j, i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.8)$$

which yields the linear SAR empirical specification.

Example 4 (*Private Provision of Public Goods in a Network*). Consider a version of the model of Bramoullé and Kranton (2007) with covariates (see also Bramoullé et al. (2014) for further discussion). In such models public goods are local: agent i benefits from or is damaged by their neighbour's good provision. Then, for a network W where $w_{ij} = 1$ if agents i and j are neighbours, and zero otherwise, agent i 's payoff from taking action y_i is given by

$$u_i(y_i, y_{-i}, x_i, W) = b_i \left(y_i + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} y_j - x_i' \beta \right) - \kappa_i y_i, \quad (2.9)$$

where $b_i(\cdot)$ is differentiable, strictly increasing and concave in y_i , κ_i is marginal cost with $b_i'(0) > \kappa_i > b_i'(\infty)$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. This yields the best responses

$$y_i^* = x_i' \beta + \bar{y}_i - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} y_j, i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2.10)$$

where $b_i'(\bar{y}_i) \equiv \kappa_i$. The system (2.10) implies a linear SAR empirical specification.

3 Test statistic

We aim to develop a test of

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : f(x) = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

for all x and for some admissible λ and β . Our testing strategy will involve a sieve expansion of $f(\cdot)$ but parameter estimates that can be obtained simply under the null hypothesis (3.1).

Let $\psi_j(z)$, for $j = 1, \dots, p$, be a user-chosen set of basis functions such that

$$f(z) = \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j \psi_j(z) + r(z), \quad (3.2)$$

with $p = p_n$ being a divergent deterministic sequence, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p)'$ a vector of unknown series coefficients and $r(z)$ an approximation error. Let $\theta = (\lambda, \beta)'$ denote admissible parameter values. We define our approximate null hypothesis as

$$\mathcal{H}_{0A} : \alpha_i = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, p, \quad \text{for some } \theta_0 \in \Theta, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\Theta = \Lambda \times \mathfrak{R}^k$, Λ not necessarily compact. Define the $n \times 1$ vector

$$S_p(\lambda, \alpha, y) = y - \lambda W y - \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j \psi_j(w'_1 y), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j \psi_j(w'_n y) \right)'. \quad (3.4)$$

Under \mathcal{H}_{0A} , we have $S_p(\lambda_0, y) = y - \lambda_0 W y$, consistent with the linear SAR model.

Our test statistic is based on determining if the moment conditions for the instrumental variables (IV) estimate of θ_0 under the null hypothesis are close enough to zero. We allow for over-identification, and thus we refer to our estimation method as Two-Stage Least Squares (2SLS) henceforth, see e.g. Kelejian and Prucha (1998). Given the expansion in (3.2), the approximate IV objective function is

$$\mathcal{Q}_p(\lambda, \beta, \alpha, y) = \frac{1}{n} (S_p(\lambda, \alpha, y) - X\beta)' P_Z (S_p(\lambda, \alpha, y) - X\beta), \quad (3.5)$$

where Z is a $n \times m$ matrix of valid instruments, with $m \geq p+k+1$, and $P_Z = Z(Z'Z)^{-1}Z'$. We will specify the components of the instrument matrix in more detail in the next section. Now, for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, define the $n \times 1$ vector $\Upsilon_j(y) = (\psi_j(w'_1 y), \dots, \psi_j(w'_n y))'$ and the $n \times (p+k+1)$ matrix $U = \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_1(y) & \dots & \Upsilon_p(y) & W y & X \end{pmatrix}$ with elements u_{ij} .

To construct our test statistic, we will now introduce the gradient of (3.5) and its

covariance matrix. Define the $(p + k + 1) \times 1$ gradient vector $\tilde{d}(\lambda, \beta, y)$ under \mathcal{H}_{0A} as

$$\tilde{d}(\lambda, \beta, y) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}(\lambda, \alpha, \beta, y)}{\partial (\alpha, \lambda, \beta)'} = -\frac{2}{n} U' P_Z (y - \lambda W y - X \beta). \quad (3.6)$$

We denote by $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\beta})'$ the 2SLS estimate of $\theta_0 = (\lambda_0, \beta_0)'$ under \mathcal{H}_{0A} . Then the gradient evaluated at the residuals corresponding to $\hat{\theta}$ is

$$\hat{d} = \tilde{d}(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\beta}, y) = -\frac{2}{n} U' P_Z (y - \hat{\lambda} W y - X \hat{\beta}). \quad (3.7)$$

Likewise, let $\hat{\Sigma}$ be the diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\hat{c}_i^2 = \left(y_i - \hat{\lambda} \sum_j w_{ij} y_j - x_i' \hat{\beta} \right)^2$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $\hat{J} = n^{-1} Z' U$, where \hat{J} is $m \times (p + k + 1)$, and define the two $m \times m$ matrices $\hat{M} = n^{-1} Z' Z$, $\hat{\Omega} = n^{-1} Z' \hat{\Sigma} Z$. The covariance matrix of the gradient evaluated at the estimates is

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\beta}, y) = 4 \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{\Omega} \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{J}, \quad (3.8)$$

and we thence define our test statistic as

$$\mathcal{T} = \frac{n \hat{d}' \hat{H}^{-1} \hat{d} - p}{\sqrt{2p}}. \quad (3.9)$$

This is a weighted measure of the distance of the gradient from zero, centred and rescaled to account for $p \rightarrow \infty$. Equivalently, we can define the test statistic as

$$\mathcal{T} = \frac{n \hat{d}'_p \hat{H}^{11} \hat{d}_p - p}{\sqrt{2p}}, \quad (3.10)$$

where \hat{d}_p contains the first p components of the $(p + k + 1)$ vector defined in (3.7) and \hat{H}^{11} denotes the top-left $p \times p$ block of \hat{H}^{-1} , a notational convention that we maintain for any square matrix considered in the paper.

4 Asymptotic theory

We commence this section by introducing some technical assumptions to establish the limiting behaviour of (3.9) under \mathcal{H}_{0A} .

Assumption 1. For all n , ϵ_i are independent random variables with zero mean and unknown variance $\sigma_i^2 \in [k, K]$, $k > 0$, and, for some $\delta > 0$, $\mathbb{E} |\epsilon_i|^{4+\delta} \leq K$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Assumption 2. $\mathbb{E}(x_{il}^4) \leq K$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $l = 1, \dots, k$.

The possibility that $\text{cov}(\epsilon_i, x_{ij}) \neq 0$, for some $j = 1, \dots, k$, is not ruled out by Assumptions 1 and 2 and thus X might contain some endogenous columns. We denote by

X_1 the $n \times k_1$ matrix containing the subset of exogenous columns of X , while X_2 ($n \times k_2$, with $k_2 = k - k_1$) contains the endogenous ones.

Now, for a generic symmetric positive-definite matrix A let $\overline{eig}(A)$ and $\underline{eig}(A)$ denote its largest and smallest eigenvalues, respectively. For a generic matrix B , denote by $\|B\| = \sqrt{\overline{eig}(B'B)}$, i.e. the spectral norm of B , and by $\|B\|_\infty$ its largest absolute row sum.

Assumption 3. (i) For all n , $w_{ii} = 0$. (ii) For all sufficiently large n , $\|W\|_\infty + \|W'\|_\infty \leq K$. (iii) For all sufficiently large n , uniformly in $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $w_{ij} = O(1/h)$, where $h = h_n$ is a sequence bounded away from zero for all n and is either bounded or satisfies $h/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Assumption 4. For all sufficiently large n , $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (\|(I - \lambda W)^{-1}\|_\infty + \|(I - \lambda W')^{-1}\|_\infty) \leq K$.

Assumption 5. The $m \times m$ matrix $M = \mathbb{E}(\hat{M})$, with $m \geq k + p + 1$, satisfies

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{eig}(M) < \infty, \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig}(M) > 0 \quad (4.1)$$

and the $(p + k + 1) \times (p + k + 1)$ matrix $L = n^{-1}\mathbb{E}(U'U)$ satisfies

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{eig}(L) < \infty, \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig}(L) > 0 \quad (4.2)$$

for n large enough. For some $\nu > 0$ satisfying $n/p^{(\nu+1/2)} = o(1)$, $\sup_z r(z) = O_p(p^{-\nu})$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. $\mathbb{E}(z_{i1}^4) + \mathbb{E}(u_{i2}^4) \leq K$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $l_1 = 1, \dots, m$ and $l_2 = 1, \dots, p + k + 1$, and ϵ_i and z_j are uncorrelated for each $i, j = 1, \dots, n$.

Assumptions 3 and 4 are rather standard restrictions on the spatial weight matrix, helping to control spatial dependence, see e.g. Lee (2002, 2004). Assumption 5 imposes regularity on model primitives and the approximation error. In particular, (4.2) implies that \hat{J} has full rank $p + k + 1$ for sufficiently large n , while (4.1) is a standard asymptotic boundedness and no-collinearity condition. Our instrument set Z contains, together with at least k_2 columns of instruments for the endogenous covariates X_2 , the columns also of X_1 , WX_1 and a set of instruments z_{ij} , $i = 1, \dots, n$. These would be of the form $\psi_q \left(\sum_j w_{ij} x_{1,jl} \right)$, where $q = 1, \dots, p$, and $x_{1,jl}$ denotes the (j, l) th element of X_1 , with $l = 1, \dots, k_1$. Thus, independence between ϵ_i and z_j requires that ϵ_i and $x_{1,jl}$ are independent for all $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ and $l = 1, \dots, k_1$. For more discussion on approximation error decay rates see e.g. Chen (2007).

Finally, we impose

Assumption 6. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{Z'Z} &= \sup_{0 \leq l, k \leq m} \left(\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}(z_{il} z_{ik} z_{jl} z_{jk}) - \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_{il} z_{ik} \right) \right)^2 \right) \\ \Delta_{Z'U} &= \sup_{0 \leq l \leq m, 0 \leq k \leq p+k+1} \left(\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}(z_{il} u_{ik} z_{jl} u_{jk}) - \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_{il} u_{ik} \right) \right)^2 \right),\end{aligned}$$

and assume

$$\Delta_{Z'Z} + \Delta_{Z'U} = O(n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

Assumption 6 guarantees that a type of weak law of large numbers holds and enforces a suitable bound on cross-sectional dependence in the spirit of Lee and Robinson (2016). This can be checked under a variety of conditions such as linear process representations for the underlying random variables or with the near epoch dependence conditions of Jenish and Prucha (2012). Writing $J = E(\hat{J})$, we can now state the following result that is analogous to but stronger than a weak law of large numbers.

Lemma 1. *Let $p^2/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and suppose that Assumption 6 holds. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\left\| \hat{M} - M \right\| = O_p \left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}} \right), \quad \left\| \hat{J} - J \right\| = O_p \left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}} \right). \quad (4.4)$$

4.1 Null distribution

In this section we develop the asymptotic theory to establish the distribution of the test statistic in (3.9) under \mathcal{H}_{0A} . Our null asymptotic theory comprises of approximating the test statistic \mathcal{T} with a quadratic form in ϵ , weighted by population quantities. We will then show that this approximation is asymptotically standard normal. To start, we define the population quantities corresponding to (3.7), or to its equivalent representation in (A.6), and to (3.8) under \mathcal{H}_{0A} as

$$\begin{aligned}d &= d(\lambda_0, \beta_0, y) = -\frac{2}{n} J' M^{-1/2} \left(I - M^{-1/2} N (N' M^{-1} N)^{-1} N' M^{-1/2} \right) M^{-1/2} Z' \epsilon \\ &= -\frac{2}{n} J' M^{-1/2} \mathcal{M}_{NM} M^{-1/2} Z' \epsilon,\end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{NM} = \left(I - M^{-1/2} N (N' M^{-1} N)^{-1} N' M^{-1/2} \right)$ is $m \times m$ and $N = \mathbb{E}(\hat{N})$, with $\hat{N} = n^{-1} Z'(W y, X)$, which is an $n \times (k+1)$ matrix with full rank under (4.2) in Assumption

5, and

$$H = n\mathbb{E}(dd') = 4J'M^{-1/2}\mathcal{M}_{NM}M^{-1/2}\Omega M^{-1/2}\mathcal{M}_{NM}M^{-1/2}J, \quad (4.6)$$

with $\Omega = n^{-1}\mathbb{E}(Z'\Sigma Z)$ and Σ the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with diagonal given by $\sigma_i^2, i = 1, \dots, n$. Under Assumptions 1 and 5, H^{-1} exists and is non-singular for n large enough, via the following lemma for the eigenvalues of Ω .

Lemma 2. *Under Assumptions 1 and 5,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\text{eig}}(\Omega) < \infty \text{ and } \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{\text{eig}}(\Omega) > 0.$$

Also, by construction, the $m \times m$ matrix \mathcal{M}_{NM} has rank $m - k - 1$, which grows like m as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because k is fixed. By relying on the auxiliary Theorem A1, reported in Appendix A, we can show that \mathcal{T} can be approximated by a quadratic form in ϵ , as desired. Indeed, we derive

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1-6, under \mathcal{H}_{0A} in (3.3) and $p^3/n = o(1)$,*

$$\mathcal{T} - \frac{nd'H^{-1}d - p}{\sqrt{2p}} = o_p(1), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.7)$$

Thence, we are now ready to prove the main result of this section, which is the asymptotic standard normality of \mathcal{T} under the null hypothesis.

Theorem 2. *Under \mathcal{H}_0 , Assumptions 1-6 and $p^3/n = o(1)$,*

$$\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.8)$$

Theorem 2 provides asymptotic justification for using one-sided, standard normal critical values as observed also by Hong and White (1995). However, in practice, a user of the test may be faced with moderate values of p . In this situation, the results of the asymptotic test can be compared with a test that employs $(\chi_p^2 - p)/\sqrt{2p}$ as the distribution from which its critical values are computed. The comparison will be studied by means of a Monte Carlo experiment in Section 5. Observe that one could equivalently just compare the $nd'\hat{H}^{-1}\hat{d}$ to critical values from a χ_p^2 distribution in practice. The standardized χ_p^2 version however allows us to compare the critical values to those from standard normal distribution.

4.2 Power properties: Consistency

In this section we establish the consistency of our test, specifically against the alternative

$$\mathcal{H}_{1A} : \alpha_i \neq 0, \quad \text{for some } i = 1, \dots, p, \text{ and any } \theta \in \Theta. \quad (4.9)$$

To examine power properties, we introduce the unrestricted quantities

$$\epsilon_{Ui}(\alpha, \lambda, \beta) = y_i - \alpha' \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_1(w'_i y) \\ \dots \\ \Upsilon_p(w'_i y) \end{pmatrix} - \beta' x_i - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} y_j \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Omega}_U = \tilde{\Omega}_U(\alpha, \lambda, \beta) = n^{-1} Z' \tilde{\Sigma}_U Z, \quad (4.10)$$

where $\tilde{\Sigma}_U$ is a diagonal matrix with $\tilde{\Sigma}_{Uii} = \epsilon_{Ui}^2(\alpha, \lambda, \beta)$. Clearly, $\hat{\Omega} = \tilde{\Omega}_U(0_{p \times 1}, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\beta})$.

Let $\gamma = (\alpha, \lambda, \beta) \in \Gamma = \mathfrak{R}^p \times \Lambda \times \mathfrak{R}^k$ and introduce:

Assumption 7. For all sufficiently large n and all $j = 1, \dots, p + k + 1$,

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \overline{eig}(\tilde{\Omega}_U) = O_p(1), \quad \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \overline{eig} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{\Omega}_U}{\partial \gamma_j} \right) = O_p(1), \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\left\{ \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \underline{eig}(\tilde{\Omega}_U) \right\}^{-1} = O_p(1), \quad \left\{ \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \underline{eig} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{\Omega}_U(\gamma)}{\partial \gamma_j} \right) \right\}^{-1} = O_p(1). \quad (4.12)$$

This assumption places some mild regularity on behaviour under the sequence of alternatives \mathcal{H}_{1A} , reminiscent of standard boundedness and invertibility conditions. We can now state the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 3. Under Assumptions 1-7 and $p^3/n = o(1)$, \mathcal{T} provides a consistent test.

4.3 Power properties: Detection of local alternatives

We aim to assess the local power of our test by considering the sequence of local alternatives

$$\mathcal{H}_\ell : \alpha_j = \alpha_{jn} = \frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{n}} \delta_j, \quad \text{for at least one } j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (4.13)$$

where δ_j is a finite constant and the $p^{1/4}$ factor accounts for the cost of the nonparametric approach; see e.g de Jong and Bierens (1994), Hong and White (1995) and Gupta and Seo (2023) for a similar dampening factor. We denote by α_{0n} the value of the $p \times 1$ vector α under \mathcal{H}_ℓ and $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_p)'$ with $\|\delta\| = 1$. We also define

$$\mathcal{V} = \begin{pmatrix} I_p \\ -(N'M^{-1}N)^{-1}N'M^{-1}\Xi \end{pmatrix} (4J'M^{-1}\Omega M^{-1}J)^{11} (I_p ; -\Xi'M^{-1}N(N'M^{-1}N)^{-1}), \quad (4.14)$$

where $\Xi = \mathbb{E}(\hat{\Xi})$ and $\hat{\Xi} = n^{-1}Z' \left(\Upsilon_1(y) \ \dots \ \Upsilon_p(y) \right)$.

Theorem 4. *Under \mathcal{H}_ℓ , Assumptions 1-6, and $p^3/n = o(1)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow{d} N(\varrho, 1), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\varrho = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta' \Xi' M^{-1} J \mathcal{V} J' M^{-1} \Xi \delta$.

5 Monte Carlo

In this section we report the results of a simulation exercise with $k = 3$, $\lambda_0 = 0.4$, $\beta_0 = (0.5, -2, 1)'$. The $n \times 3$ matrix X has ones in its first column, while elements in the second and third columns are generated in each replication as i.i.d. random variables from $U[-2, 2]$ and $U[-2.5, 2.5]$, respectively. We employ the Hermite polynomials for the basis functions $\psi_j(\cdot)$. We generate ϵ_i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$, as

$$\epsilon_i = \sigma_i \zeta_i, \tag{5.1}$$

with ζ_i generated either from standard normal distribution, or, t-distribution with 5 degrees of freedom (t_5), and employ two mechanisms for the scale parameter σ_i :

- a) Direct construction using the formula

$$\sigma_i = \frac{d_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n d_j/n}, \tag{5.2}$$

where d_i denotes the number of neighbours of unit i , such that, for each generic W , $d_i = \text{card}(j : w_{ij} \neq 0, i \neq j)$.

- b) The σ_i^2 are randomly generated values from a χ_2^2 distribution.

With both methods, the σ_i are kept fixed across simulations and across different weight matrix scenarios. The heteroskedasticity design in (5.2) is in line with the simulation work in Kelejian and Prucha (2010) and Arraiz et al. (2010), and is motivated by situations in which heteroskedasticity arises as units across different regions may have different numbers of neighbours. In contrast, the design b) yields error heteroskedasticity that is independent of the spatial dependence implied by the weight matrix.

We construct the matrix Z as $n \times (p + k + 2)$ matrix with i -th row

$$\left(1, x_{i2}, x_{i3}, w'_i x_2, w'_i x_3, \psi_1(w'_i x_{\ell_1}), \psi_2(w'_i x_{\ell_2}), \dots, \psi_p(w'_i x_{\ell_p}) \right)'$$

with $\ell_1, \ell_4, \ell_5, \ell_8, \ell_9, \ell_{12} = 2$ and $\ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_6, \ell_7, \ell_{10}, \ell_{11} = 3$. We alternate x_{i2} and x_{i3} inside $\psi_j(\cdot)$ in this way so as to ensure both variables appear in odd and even degree polynomials.

We report below empirical sizes and powers for $n = 100, 200, 400, 700, 1000, 2000$ based on 1000 Monte Carlo replications. We set p as the integer part of $n^{1/3}$, leading to $p = 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12$ for $n = 100, 200, 400, 700, 1000, 2000$, respectively, and use a nominal size set at $\alpha = 0.05$. Because our test statistic is a standardized chi-squared type statistic, for small p , critical values based on the standardized χ_p^2 distribution may provide better finite sample approximation than those based on the asymptotic standard normal approximation. Hence we use two critical values, one based on χ_p^2 and defined as $(\chi_{p,1-\alpha}^2 - p)/\sqrt{2p}$ where $\chi_{p,1-\alpha}^2$ is the $1-\alpha$ -th percentile of the χ_p^2 distribution, and the other as the $1-\alpha$ -th percentile of the standard normal distribution. For $p = 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12$, the χ_p^2 -based critical values are 1.9403, 1.9195, 1.8887, 1.8767, 1.8575 and 1.8424, respectively, significantly larger than the critical value based on normal distribution, 1.645. Hence we expect tests based on asymptotic normality to be oversized for small n , which is indeed what we observe below.

5.1 Size

We generate y according to (2.1) under \mathcal{H}_0 using five different configurations for W , motivated by a range of empirical situations.

- 1) Exponential distance: $w_{ij} = \exp(-|\ell_i - \ell_j|)1(|\ell_i - \ell_j| < \log n)$ where ℓ_i is location of i along the interval $[0, n]$ which is generated from i.i.d. $U[0, n]$.
- 2) Cutoff: W^* is generated as $w_{ij}^* = \Phi(-d_{ij})I(c_{ij} < n^{-2/3})$ if $i \neq j$, and $w_{ii}^* = 0$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal cdf, $d_{ij} \sim$ i.i.d. $U[-3, 3]$ and $c_{ij} \sim$ i.i.d. $U[0, 1]$ and we set $W = W^*/1.1\|W^*\|$.
- 3) Circulant: W is a matrix with $W_{i,i-1} = W_{i,i+1} = 0.5, i = 1, \dots, n$.
- 4) Random: W is randomly generated as an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix of zeros and ones, where the number of ‘ones’ is set to be the integer part of $2n^{6/5}$. This matrix emulates a contiguity matrix. The average number of non-zero elements in a row ranges 5-9.2 for our choices of n .
- 5) Lattice: we envisage the following system of difference equations along a regular lattice in \mathbb{R}^2 with $Y_{0,j} = 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, m_2$ and $Y_{k,0} = 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, m_1$:

$$Y_{k,j} = 0.4(Y_{k-1,j} + Y_{k,j-1}) + X'_{k,j}\beta + \epsilon_{k,j}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m_1, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m_2.$$

To obtain $n = m_1 m_2$ with magnitudes in line with other choices of n , we use $(m_1, m_2) = (10, 10), (14, 15), (20, 20), (26, 27), (31, 32), (44, 45)$ leading to

Table 1: Monte Carlo size of test of \mathcal{H}_{0A} , Gaussian error with heteroskedasticity a) and b), using critical values based on χ_p^2 and standard normal distributions

σ_i	n, p	χ_p^2 -based					$N(0, 1)$ -based				
		expo.	cutoff	circ.	rand.	latt.	expo.	cutoff	circ.	rand.	latt.
a)	100, 4	0.044	0.052	0.052	0.051	0.056	0.070	0.100	0.102	0.078	0.093
	200, 5	0.052	0.051	0.053	0.046	0.049	0.078	0.064	0.083	0.065	0.076
	400, 7	0.051	0.050	0.048	0.050	0.051	0.083	0.063	0.068	0.065	0.068
	700, 8	0.045	0.050	0.048	0.050	0.050	0.060	0.070	0.069	0.062	0.069
	1000, 10	0.048	0.046	0.051	0.047	0.049	0.072	0.061	0.068	0.057	0.063
	2000, 12	0.050	0.053	0.049	0.052	0.049	0.061	0.063	0.061	0.067	0.059
b)	100, 4	0.051	0.052	0.060	0.048	0.056	0.081	0.081	0.09	0.074	0.089
	200, 5	0.050	0.045	0.053	0.049	0.047	0.072	0.071	0.078	0.073	0.067
	400, 7	0.048	0.049	0.051	0.050	0.052	0.063	0.073	0.065	0.073	0.074
	700, 8	0.051	0.052	0.048	0.052	0.050	0.063	0.068	0.067	0.065	0.068
	1000, 10	0.048	0.051	0.049	0.048	0.051	0.069	0.061	0.069	0.067	0.071
	2000, 12	0.047	0.045	0.050	0.047	0.051	0.068	0.062	0.060	0.058	0.064

Nominal size: $\alpha = 0.05$. For lattice, $n = 100, 210, 400, 702, 992, 1980$. Columns 3-7 are results from using χ_p^2 -based critical values while columns 8-12 are based on using standard normal-based critical values.

$n = 100, 210, 400, 702, 992, 1980$, respectively. We generate the corresponding W with $i = m_2(k - 1) + j$, so that

$$W(m_2(k - 1) + j, m_2(k - 2) + j) = W(m_2(k - 1) + j, m_2(k - 1) + j - 1) = 1$$

are the nonzero elements of the weight matrix.

All W are normalized by their spectral norms, and for specifications 1), 2) and 4), W are stochastically generated and then fixed across replications.

We present Monte Carlo size results for nominal size of 5% for Gaussian and t_5 errors in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Tests based on the standardized χ_p^2 distribution lead to good empirical sizes even for small n across all weight matrix designs, while relying on asymptotic normality leads to some oversizing, as anticipated. The extent of oversizing reduces with larger n and p , as expected, but the oversizing still remains at $n = 2000$. Hence, the standardized χ_p^2 -based critical value can provide a useful robustness check to the normal approximation in practice.

5.2 Power

Power analysis requires data generation from a nonlinear model, which in general requires the solving of n nonlinear equations at every iteration, a futile task. We resolve this issue by generating the following two nonlinear SAR models on a lattice, similar to Jenish (2016). Letting k and j denote indices across \mathfrak{R}^2 as before and setting $Y_{0,j} = 0, j =$

Table 2: Monte Carlo size of test of \mathcal{H}_{0A} , t_5 error with heteroskedasticity a) and b), using critical values based on χ_p^2 and standard normal distributions

σ_i	n, p	χ_p^2 -based					$N(0, 1)$ -based				
		expo.	cutoff	circ.	rand.	latt.	expo.	cutoff	circ.	rand.	latt.
a)	100, 4	0.064	0.069	0.064	0.068	0.059	0.097	0.106	0.097	0.100	0.085
	200, 5	0.049	0.055	0.046	0.051	0.056	0.068	0.085	0.071	0.082	0.082
	400, 7	0.052	0.049	0.051	0.049	0.050	0.070	0.079	0.076	0.076	0.073
	700, 8	0.050	0.049	0.047	0.048	0.051	0.065	0.052	0.069	0.065	0.073
	1000, 10	0.046	0.048	0.050	0.045	0.050	0.059	0.068	0.072	0.060	0.068
	2000, 12	0.047	0.047	0.051	0.050	0.045	0.063	0.056	0.064	0.070	0.068
b)	100, 4	0.070	0.065	0.074	0.057	0.073	0.097	0.083	0.109	0.083	0.115
	200, 5	0.052	0.051	0.054	0.048	0.058	0.082	0.077	0.085	0.075	0.087
	400, 7	0.049	0.052	0.048	0.051	0.050	0.075	0.074	0.070	0.071	0.072
	700, 8	0.048	0.047	0.055	0.051	0.049	0.075	0.074	0.082	0.068	0.072
	1000, 10	0.045	0.050	0.049	0.050	0.050	0.068	0.064	0.066	0.068	0.065
	2000, 12	0.049	0.052	0.052	0.047	0.051	0.075	0.067	0.064	0.058	0.064

Nominal size: $\alpha = 0.05$. For lattice, $n = 100, 210, 400, 702, 992, 1980$. Columns 3-7 are results from using χ_p^2 -based critical values while columns 8-12 are based on using standard normal-based critical values.

$1, 2, \dots, m_2$ and $Y_{k,0} = 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, m_1$:

$$Y_{k,j} = \arctan(Y_{k-1,j} + Y_{k,j-1}) + X'_{k,j}\beta + \epsilon_{k,j}, \quad k = 1, \dots, m_1, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_2$$

and

$$Y_{k,j} = \log(1 + 0.25(Y_{k-1,j} + Y_{k,j-1})^2) + X'_{k,j}\beta + \epsilon_{k,j}, \quad k = 1, \dots, m_1, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_2$$

We use the lattice weight matrix given as case 5) in the previous subsection, which correctly picks out the relevant neighbours but the misspecification lies in the linearity of SAR model being fitted. In line with the previous section, we report power results for $p = 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12$ for $n = 100, 210, 400, 702, 992, 1980$ respectively.

Tables 3 and 4 present empirical power of the test of \mathcal{H}_{0A} , employing Gaussian and t_5 errors, respectively. Power is better in general when the error has heteroskedasticity of form a) compared to b), as one would expect given the random nature of error heteroskedasticity in b). The empirical power improves with larger n for both settings of nonlinear SAR, although the improvement is somewhat slow for t_5 error combined with heteroskedasticity of type b).

Table 3: Monte Carlo power of test of of \mathcal{H}_{0A} , Gaussian error with heteroskedasticity a) and b), using critical values based on χ_p^2 and standard normal distributions

σ_i	n, p	χ_p^2 -based		$N(0, 1)$ -based	
		\log	\arctan	\log	\arctan
a)	100, 4	0.209	0.149	0.263	0.204
	210, 5	0.324	0.270	0.379	0.335
	400, 7	0.525	0.426	0.594	0.494
	702, 8	0.729	0.685	0.767	0.734
	992, 10	0.849	0.831	0.877	0.858
	1980, 12	0.992	0.991	0.997	0.993
b)	100, 4	0.170	0.120	0.214	0.156
	210, 5	0.202	0.148	0.243	0.202
	400, 7	0.315	0.214	0.373	0.270
	702, 8	0.435	0.327	0.483	0.394
	992, 10	0.598	0.457	0.647	0.518
	1980, 12	0.861	0.786	0.883	0.816

Data generated as nonlinear SAR. Columns 3-4 are results from using χ_p^2 -based critical values while columns 5-6 are those from using standard normal-based critical values.

Table 4: Monte Carlo power of test of of \mathcal{H}_{0A} , t_5 error with heteroskedasticity a) and b), using critical values based on χ_p^2 and standard normal distributions

σ_i	n, p	χ_p^2 -based		$N(0, 1)$ -based	
		\log	\arctan	\log	\arctan
a)	100, 4	0.177	0.127	0.238	0.168
	210, 5	0.249	0.179	0.305	0.232
	400, 7	0.348	0.297	0.395	0.35
	702, 8	0.537	0.454	0.584	0.507
	992, 10	0.666	0.598	0.704	0.635
	1980, 12	0.940	0.889	0.952	0.907
b)	100, 4	0.137	0.097	0.19	0.129
	210, 5	0.162	0.12	0.21	0.156
	400, 7	0.219	0.161	0.27	0.215
	702, 8	0.287	0.211	0.337	0.253
	992, 10	0.379	0.258	0.423	0.302
	1980, 12	0.642	0.470	0.690	0.517

Data generated as nonlinear SAR. Columns 3-4 are results from using χ_p^2 -based critical values while columns 5-6 are those from using standard normal-based critical values.

6 Tax competition between Finnish municipalities

Numerous studies have used a linear SAR specification to test for the presence of competitive behaviour in neighbouring governments' tax-setting decisions. While many had found the presence of tax competition based on a spatial IV approach or QML methods (see an extensive list given in Allers and Elhorst (2005)), Lyytikäinen (2012) used a policy-based IV to estimate the SAR parameter and found it to be insignificant. In this section we apply our test of linearity to data from Lyytikäinen (2012) to try and shed light on this discrepancy.

We begin with some institutional background. Finland's municipalities set their own property tax rates within limits imposed by the central government. This raises the question of whether neighbouring municipalities compete on tax rates to attract investment. To study this question, Lyytikäinen (2012) used a linear SAR model with fixed effects such that

$$t_{it} = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} t_{jt} + X'_{it} \beta + \mu_i + \tau_t + \epsilon_{it} \quad (6.1)$$

where t_{it} denotes either municipality i 's general property tax rates or residential building tax rates in year t and μ_i and τ_t are municipality and year fixed effects, respectively. The municipality controls X_{it} include per capita income, per capita grants, unemployment rate, percentage of population aged 0-16, percentage population aged 61-75 and percentage of population aged 75+.

Lyytikäinen (2012) focused on one-year differenced data using the difference between 2000 and 1999 to allow for municipality fixed effects. This choice was to exploit the variation due to a policy of raising the common statutory lower limit to the property tax rates that was implemented in 2000. Using Δ to denote a difference between 2000 and 1999, this exogenous policy change was used to construct a suitable instrument and estimate the parameters of

$$\Delta t_i = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} \Delta t_j + \Delta X'_i \beta + \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 P_i + \gamma_2 M_i + \Delta \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 411, \quad (6.2)$$

where P_i is a dummy variable indicating whether the 1998 tax rate level for municipality i was below the new lower limit imposed in 2000 and M_i indicates the magnitude of the imposed increase for municipality i , both included to ensure exogeneity of the instruments. Lyytikäinen (2012) found the spatial parameter λ to be insignificant for both sets of regressions with either general property tax rate or residential building tax rate, and hence concluded that there is an absence of substantial tax competition between municipalities in Finland.

We apply our test of linearity in (6.2) using $p = 4, 5, 6$. We estimate the model

with the same policy instrument and row-normalized contiguity weight matrix used in Lyytikäinen (2012). We utilize the spatial IV, constructed by premultiplying ΔX_i by the weight matrix, as our additional instrumental variables required to satisfy Assumption 5, and report the results in Table 5. Our tests do not reject the null of linearity for any choice of p for both general property tax rates and residential building tax rates. This indicates that a linear SAR specification is compatible with the differenced data for Finnish municipalities. Using standardized χ_p^2 -based critical values evidently does not change our conclusions.

Table 5: Linearity test on tax rate data with fixed effects

p	General property tax rate		Residential building tax rate	
	$\hat{\lambda}$	\mathcal{T}	$\hat{\lambda}$	\mathcal{T}
4	0.0770 (0.9976)	0.6005	0.0895 (0.4680)	-1.3877
5	0.0832 (1.0984)	0.3535	0.1024 (0.5251)	-0.4511
6	0.0825 (1.0886)	-0.0419	0.1052 (0.5398)	-0.2380

Using differenced data between 2000 and 1999. $n = 411$. t-statistics in parenthesis. * $p - value < 0.1$; ** $p - value < 0.05$; *** $p - value < 0.01$.

As observed above, the absence of tax competition that Lyytikäinen (2012) finds differs from earlier findings in the literature. To try and get to the bottom of this, we observe that one notable way in which Lyytikäinen (2012) differs from previous literature listed in Allers and Elhorst (2005) is in the inclusion of municipality fixed effects. Not accounting for the time-invariant characteristics could result in spurious spatial dependence explaining the disparity of Lyytikäinen (2012)'s findings from the previous ones.

With this in mind, we now apply our test of linearity to the level data from year 2000, without fixed effects, given by

$$t_i = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} t_j + X_i' \beta + \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 P_i + \gamma_2 M_i + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 411.$$

Interestingly, we observe in Table 6 that the null of linearity is strongly rejected in the case of general property tax rates where the estimated λ is positive and significant, in contrast to the case of residential building rate where linearity is not rejected and estimated λ is insignificant. Once again, using standardized χ_p^2 -based critical values evidently does not change our conclusions.

Thus the finding of significant spatial competition in the general property tax when not accounting for municipality fixed effects appears to be due to an unreliable specification. This supports the conclusion of Lyytikäinen (2012) that there is no competitive behaviour

in the setting of Finnish property tax rates and that the linear SAR specification is a reliable model. It also offers further explanation to Lyytikäinen (2012)'s insight that previous findings of the presence of tax competition need to be viewed with caution and may be resulting from specification problems.

Table 6: Linearity test on tax rate data without fixed effects

p	General property tax rate		Residential building tax rate	
	$\hat{\lambda}$	\mathcal{T}	$\hat{\lambda}$	\mathcal{T}
4	0.4019*** (4.0877)	5.8073***	0.0955 (0.7768)	-0.3789
5	0.4236*** (4.2725)	4.7876***	0.1019 (0.8404)	-0.5596
6	0.4188*** (4.2662)	4.344***	0.1019 (0.8414)	-1.1595

Using level data from 2000. $n = 411$. t-statistics in parenthesis. * $p - value < 0.1$; ** $p - value < 0.05$; *** $p - value < 0.01$.

Appendix A

Proof of Lemma 1. $\|\hat{M} - M\|$ has variance bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m^2}{n^2} \Delta_{Z'Z} + \frac{m^2}{n^2} \sup_{l,k} \sum_i \mathbb{E}(z_{il}^2 z_{ik}^2) &\leq \frac{m^2}{n^2} \Delta_{Z'Z} + \frac{m^2}{n^2} \sup_{l,k} \sum_i (\mathbb{E}(z_{il}^4))^{1/2} (\mathbb{E}(z_{ik}^4))^{1/2} \\ &= O\left(\frac{p^2}{n}\right) + O\left(\frac{p^2}{n}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the first equality holds under (4.3), since $m \sim p$, and the second one follows as long as $p/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$ under Assumption 5. The proof for $\|\hat{J} - J\|$ is similar. \square

Theorem A1. *Under Assumptions 1-6, under \mathcal{H}_{0A} in (3.3), for $p^{3/2}/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\|\hat{d} - d\| = O_p\left(\frac{p^{3/2}}{n}\right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Proof. We first show the following rate for the IV/2SLS estimator under \mathcal{H}_{0A} in (3.3)

$$\|\hat{\theta} - \theta_0\| = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}\right), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\theta_0 = (\lambda_0, \beta_0)'$ and $\mathbb{X} = (W'y, X)$. We write, under Assumptions 2, 5 and 6,

$$\|\hat{\theta} - \theta_0\| = \left\| \left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{X}' P_Z \mathbb{X} \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{X}' P_Z \epsilon \right\| \leq K \left\| \frac{Z' \epsilon}{n} \right\| = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}\right), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

since under Assumptions 1 and 5, $\|Z' \epsilon/n\|$ has variance bounded by

$$\frac{K}{n^2} m \sup_{0 < j \leq p} \mathbb{E}(z'_j \epsilon)^2 = \frac{K}{n^2} m \sup_{0 < j \leq p} \sum_t \mathbb{E}(z_{tj}^2) \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_t^2) = O\left(\frac{m}{n}\right) = O\left(\frac{p}{n}\right). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Let $R = (r(w'_1 y), \dots, r(w'_n y))'$ be the $n \times 1$ vector of approximation errors and (3.2). We denote its i -th component by R_i . Also, from the 2SLS expression for $\hat{\theta} - \theta_0$ in (A.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d} &= -\frac{2}{n} U' P_Z (I - \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{X}' P_Z \mathbb{X})^{-1} \mathbb{X}' P_Z) \epsilon - \frac{2}{n} U' P_Z R \\ &= -\frac{2}{n} U' P_Z (I - P_Z \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{X}' P_Z \mathbb{X})^{-1} \mathbb{X}' P_Z) P_Z \epsilon - \frac{2}{n} U' P_Z R \\ &= -\frac{2}{n} \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1/2} \left(I - \hat{M}^{-1/2} \hat{N} \left(\hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} \right)^{-1} \hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1/2} \right) \hat{M}^{-1/2} Z' \epsilon - \frac{2}{n} \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1} Z' R \\ &= -\frac{2}{n} \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1/2} \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM} \hat{M}^{-1/2} Z' \epsilon - \frac{2}{n} \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1} Z' R, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM} = \left(I - \hat{M}^{-1/2} \hat{N} \left(\hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} \right)^{-1} \hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1/2} \right)$.

From (3.7), we write

$$\left\| \hat{d} - d \right\| \leq \left\| \frac{2}{n} \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1/2} \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM} \hat{M}^{-1/2} Z' \epsilon - \frac{2}{n} J' M^{-1/2} \mathcal{M}_{NM} M^{-1/2} Z' \epsilon \right\| + \left\| \frac{2}{n} \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1} Z' R \right\|. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

By standard algebra, the first term in (A.7) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{J} - J \right\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| + \|J\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| \\ & + \left\| \hat{J} - J \right\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{N} \right\| \left\| \left(\hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{N} \right\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| \\ & + \|J\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{N} \right\| \left\| \left(\hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{N} \right\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| \\ & + \|J\| \left\| M^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{N} - N \right\| \left\| \left(\hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{N} \right\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| \\ & + \|J\| \left\| M^{-1} \right\| \|N\| \left\| \left(\hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} \right)^{-1} - \left(N' M^{-1} N \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{N} \right\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| \\ & + \|J\| \left\| M^{-1} \right\| \|N\| \left\| \left(N' M^{-1} N \right)^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{N} - N \right\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| \\ & + \|J\| \left\| M^{-1} \right\| \|N\| \left\| \left(N' M^{-1} N \right)^{-1} \right\| \|N\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1} \right\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

From (A.5), $\|Z' \epsilon / n\| = O_p(\sqrt{p/n})$. Under Assumption 6, we have

$$\left\| \hat{N} - N \right\| = O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \hat{J} - J \right\| = O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Also, under Assumptions 5 and 6,

$$\left\| \hat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1} \right\| \leq \|M^{-1}\| \left\| \hat{M}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{M} - M \right\| = O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

and similarly, using analogous arguments (omitted to avoid repetitions), under Assumptions 5 and 6,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} \right)^{-1} - \left(N' M^{-1} N \right)^{-1} \right\| & \leq \|N' M^{-1} N\| \left\| \hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N}' \right\| \left\| \hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} - N' M^{-1} N \right\| \\ & = O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The first term at the RHS of (A.7) is thus $O_p(p^{3/2}/n)$. The second term at the RHS

of (A.7) is instead

$$\left\| \frac{2}{n} \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1} Z' R \right\| = O_p \left(\frac{1}{n} \|R\| \|Z\| \right) = O_p(p^{-\nu}), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where the first equality at the RHS of (A.12) follows under Assumptions 5 and 6. The second equality follows since $\|Z\| = O_p(\sqrt{n})$ under Assumptions 5 and 6, and each component of the $n \times 1$ vector R is $O_p(p^{-\nu})$ by Assumption 5, and hence $\|R\| = O_p(\sqrt{n} p^{-\nu})$. The third equality in (A.12) follows from Assumption 5.

Under Assumption 6, the first term in (A.7) dominates the second one as long as ν satisfies $n/p^{\nu+3/2} = o(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which holds under Assumptions 5. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. First, under Assumptions 1 and 5,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{eig}(\Omega) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Omega\| = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|n^{-1} \mathbb{E}(Z' \Sigma Z)\| \leq \sup_i \sigma_i^2 \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{\mathbb{E}(Z' Z)}{n} \right\| \\ &= \sup_i \sigma_i^2 \|M\| < K. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig}(\Omega) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{Z' \Sigma Z}{n} \right) \right) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\sum_i z_i z_i' \sigma_i^2}{n} \right) \right) \\ &\geq \inf_i \sigma_i^2 \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig}(M) > k, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

again under Assumptions 1 and 5. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. The claim in Theorem 1 is equivalent to

$$\hat{d}' \hat{H}^{-1} \hat{d} - d' H^{-1} d = o_p \left(\frac{\sqrt{p}}{n} \right). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

From some standard manipulations, the LHS of (A.15) can be written as

$$\left(\hat{d} - d \right)' \hat{H}^{-1} \hat{d} + d' H^{-1} (\hat{d} - d) + d' \hat{H}^{-1} (H - \hat{H}) H^{-1} \hat{d}. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

The norm of the last displayed expression is bounded by

$$K \left\| \hat{d} - d \right\| \left\| \hat{H}^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{d} \right\| + K \left\| \hat{d} - d \right\| \left\| H^{-1} \right\| \|d\| + K \|d\| \left\| \hat{H}^{-1} \right\| \left\| H - \hat{H} \right\| \left\| H^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{d} \right\|. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

From Theorem A1, $\left\| \hat{d} - d \right\| = O_p(p^{3/2}/n)$. Under Assumptions 5 and 6, and from (A.5)

we have $\|d\| = O\left(\sqrt{p/n}\right)$. Also, from Theorem 1,

$$\|\hat{d}\| \leq \|\hat{d} - d\| + \|d\| = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}\right), \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where the last equality follows as long as $p^2/n = o(1)$. Also, under Assumptions 1, 5 and 6, $\|\hat{H}^{-1}\| = O_p(1)$ and $\|H^{-1}\| = O_p(1)$. Thus, first and second terms in (A.17) are $O_p(p^2/n^{3/2})$, which are $o_p(p^{1/2}/n)$ if $p^3/n = o(1)$.

Using 2SLS estimates for θ_0 and in view of (A.6), we can re-write the expression in (3.8) as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} = & 4\hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1/2}\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM}\hat{M}^{-1/2}\tilde{\Omega}\hat{M}^{-1/2}\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM}\hat{M}^{-1/2}\hat{J} + \frac{4}{n}\hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1/2}\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM}\hat{M}^{-1/2}Z'\epsilon R'Z\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J} \\ & + \frac{4}{n}\hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1}Z'RR'Z\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where $\tilde{\Omega} = Z'\tilde{\Sigma}Z/n$, with $\tilde{\Sigma}$ being an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix such that $\tilde{\Sigma}_{ii} = \epsilon_i^2$. From (4.6), we write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{H} - H\| \leq & \left\| \hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1/2}\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM}\hat{M}^{-1/2}\tilde{\Omega}\hat{M}^{-1/2}\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM}\hat{M}^{-1/2}\hat{J} \right. \\ & \left. - J'M^{-1/2}\mathcal{M}_{NM}M^{-1/2}\Omega M^{-1/2}\mathcal{M}_{NM}M^{-1/2}J \right\| \\ & + \left\| \frac{4}{n}\hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1/2}\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{NM}\hat{M}^{-1/2}Z'\epsilon R'Z\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J} \right\| + \left\| \frac{4}{n}\hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1}Z'RR'Z\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J} \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

By standard algebra, the first term in (A.20) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1}\tilde{\Omega}\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J} - J'M^{-1}\Omega M^{-1}J \right\| \\ & + \left\| \hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{N}\left(\hat{N}'\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{N}\right)^{-1}\hat{N}'\hat{M}^{-1}\tilde{\Omega}\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J} - J'M^{-1}N\left(N'M^{-1}N\right)^{-1}N'M^{-1}\Omega M^{-1}J \right\| \\ & + \left\| \hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{N}\left(\hat{N}'\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{N}\right)^{-1}\hat{N}'\hat{M}^{-1}\tilde{\Omega}\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{N}\left(\hat{N}'\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{N}\right)^{-1}\hat{N}\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J} \right. \\ & \left. - J'M^{-1}N\left(N'M^{-1}N\right)^{-1}N'M^{-1}\Omega M^{-1}N\left(N'M^{-1}N\right)^{-1}NM^{-1}J \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

We provide the details of the rate of the first term in the last displayed expression, while the remaining ones follow similarly. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1}\tilde{\Omega}\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J} - J'M^{-1}\Omega M^{-1}J \right\| \leq \|\hat{J} - J\| \|\hat{M}^{-1}\|^2 \|\tilde{\Omega}\| \|\hat{J}\| \\ & + \|J\| \|\hat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1}\| \|\tilde{\Omega}\| \|\hat{M}^{-1}\| \|\hat{J}\| + \|J\| \|M^{-1}\| \|\tilde{\Omega} - \Omega\| \|\hat{M}^{-1}\| \|\hat{J}\| \\ & + \|J\| \|M^{-1}\| \|\Omega\| \|\hat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1}\| \|\hat{J}\| + \|J\| \|M^{-1}\|^2 \|\Omega\| \|\hat{J} - J\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Under Assumptions 5 and 6, most terms can be dealt with similarly to the proof of Theorem A1, and $\|\hat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1}\| = O_p(p/\sqrt{n})$ and $\|\hat{J} - J\| = O_p(p/\sqrt{n})$. We focus instead on $\|\tilde{\Omega} - \Omega\|$ and write

$$\left\| \tilde{\Omega} - \Omega \right\| \leq \left\| \tilde{\Omega} - \bar{\Omega} \right\| + \left\| \bar{\Omega} - \Omega \right\|, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

with $\bar{\Omega} = Z'\Sigma Z/n$. The first term in (A.22) is $\left\| Z'(\tilde{\Sigma} - \Sigma)Z/n \right\|$, which has second moment bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m^2}{n^2} \sup_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \sum_l \sum_k \mathbb{E}(z_{li} z_{lj} z_{ki} z_{kj}) \mathbb{E}((\epsilon_l^2 - \sigma_l^2)(\epsilon_k^2 - \sigma_k^2)) &\leq \frac{Km^2}{n^2} \sup_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \sum_l \mathbb{E}(z_{li}^2 z_{lj}^2) \\ &= O\left(\frac{p^2}{n}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

under Assumptions 1 and 5 and since $m \sim p$. Thus, $\left\| \tilde{\Omega} - \bar{\Omega} \right\| = O_p(p/\sqrt{n})$. The second term in (A.22) has mean zero and variance bounded by

$$\frac{m^2}{n^2} \sup_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \text{var} \left(\sum_l z_{li} z_{lj} \sigma_l^2 \right) \leq \sup_{1 \leq l \leq n} \sigma_l^2 \frac{m^2}{n^2} \Delta = O\left(\frac{p^2}{n}\right), \quad (\text{A.24})$$

under Assumptions 1, 5 and 6, and hence it is $O_p(p/\sqrt{n})$. Thus, $\|\tilde{\Omega} - \Omega\| = O_p(p/\sqrt{n})$. We conclude then that the expression in (A.21) is $O_p(p/\sqrt{n})$. Proceeding similarly for all other terms, we can conclude that the first term at the RHS of (A.20) is $O_p(p/\sqrt{n})$.

By similar arguments to those that led to (A.12), under Assumptions 5 and 6, the second term in (A.20) is bounded by

$$K \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| \|Z\| \|R\| = O_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{p^{\nu-1/2}}\right), \quad (\text{A.25})$$

which is negligible compared to the first term in (A.20) since $n/p^{(\nu+1/2)} = o(1)$, under Assumptions 5 and 6. Similarly, the third term in (A.20) is $O_p(np^{-2\nu})$, which is negligible compared to the first term since $n^{3/2}/p^{2\nu+1} = o(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, under Assumptions 5 and 6. We conclude that

$$\left\| \hat{H} - H \right\| = O_p(p/\sqrt{n}). \quad (\text{A.26})$$

By Assumption 6, the last term in (A.17) is thus $O_p(p^2/n^{3/2})$, given $\|d\| = O_p(\sqrt{p/n})$ and $\|\hat{d}\| = O_p(\sqrt{p/n})$. Hence, the second term in (A.17) is $o_p(\sqrt{p}/n)$ as long as $p^3/n = o(1)$, concluding the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. By Theorem 1, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{nd'H^{-1}d - p}{\sqrt{2p}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Under the null hypothesis, the above CLT is for a SAR model with an increasing number of instruments. By Remark 3 of Gupta (2018), the claim follows by a trivial modification of the arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.3 therein to allow for heteroskedastic innovations (see e.g. Korolev (2019) and the justification of claim (D.3) in Robinson (2008)). \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $\gamma = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p, \lambda, \beta)'$, partitioned as $\gamma = (\alpha', \theta)'$. Corresponding to $\tilde{d} = \partial Q / \partial \gamma$ defined in (3.6) under \mathcal{H}_{0A} , we now define the unconstrained gradient vector, $(p + k + 1) \times 1$, \tilde{d}_U as

$$\tilde{d}_U(\alpha, \lambda, \beta, y) = -\frac{2}{n} U' P_Z S_p(y, \alpha, \lambda, \beta), \quad (\text{A.27})$$

where $\tilde{d}_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda, \beta, y) = \tilde{d}$ defined in (3.6).

We partition $\hat{J} = n^{-1}U$ as $\hat{J} = (\hat{\Xi}, \hat{N})$, where $\hat{\Xi}$ and \hat{N} are $m \times p$ and $m \times (k + 1)$, respectively, with a similar partition for its expected value $J = (\Xi, N)$. Also, we define the $(p + k + 1) \times (p + k + 1)$ matrix $\hat{D} = \partial Q / \partial \gamma \partial \gamma'$, such that the first $p \times p$ block is given by

$$\hat{D}_{11} = \frac{2}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_1(y)' \\ \dots \\ \Upsilon_p(y)' \end{pmatrix} P_Z \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_1(y)' \\ \dots \\ \Upsilon_p(y)' \end{pmatrix}' = 2\hat{\Xi}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{\Xi} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

the block 1-2 (or the transposed of 2-1 block) is the $p \times (k + 1)$ matrix

$$\hat{D}_{12} = \hat{D}'_{21} = \frac{2}{n} \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_1(y)' \\ \dots \\ \Upsilon_p(y)' \end{pmatrix} P_Z \begin{pmatrix} W y & X \end{pmatrix} = 2\hat{\Xi}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

and the 2-2 block is the $(k + 1) \times (k + 1)$ matrix

$$\hat{D}_{22} = \frac{2}{n} \begin{pmatrix} X' \\ y' W' \end{pmatrix} P_Z \begin{pmatrix} W y & X \end{pmatrix} = 2\hat{N}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{N}. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Under Assumption 5, $\|\hat{D}\| = O_p(1)$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig}(\hat{D}) > 0$ with inverse defined and partitioned in the usual way. Also, \hat{D} does not depend on any unknowns. In line with our previous notation, we also define the corresponding limit quantities as $D_{11} = 2\Xi' M^{-1} \Xi$, $D_{12} = D'_{21} = \Xi' M^{-1} N$ and $D_{22} = 2N' M^{-1} N$.

From standard algebra, by a MVT, given \hat{d} in (3.7),

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{d}_p &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}}{\partial \alpha'} \Big|_{(0_{1 \times p}, \hat{\theta}')'} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}}{\partial \alpha'} \Big|_{(0_{1 \times p}, \theta'_0)'} + \hat{D}_{12}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \\ 0 &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}}{\partial \theta'} \Big|_{(0_{1 \times p}, \hat{\theta}')'} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}}{\partial \theta'} \Big|_{(0_{1 \times p}, \theta'_0)'} + \hat{D}_{22}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.31})$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{d}_p &= \left(I_p; -\hat{D}_{12}\hat{D}_{22}^{-1} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}}{\partial \alpha'} \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{Q}}{\partial \theta'} \end{pmatrix} \Big|_{(0_{1 \times p}, \theta'_0)'} = \left(I_p; -\hat{D}_{12}\hat{D}_{22}^{-1} \right) \tilde{d}_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \\ &= \left(I_p; -\hat{D}_{12}\hat{D}_{22}^{-1} \right) \tilde{d}(\lambda_0, \beta_0)\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.32})$$

according to the definition in (A.27) and (3.6), and with I_p denoting the $p \times p$ identity matrix. Hence, given \hat{H} in (3.8) and (3.10)

$$n\hat{d}'_p \hat{H}^{11} \hat{d}_p = n\tilde{d}'_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \hat{\mathcal{V}} \tilde{d}_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda_0, \beta_0), \quad (\text{A.33})$$

with

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}} = \begin{pmatrix} I_p \\ -\hat{D}_{22}^{-1}\hat{D}_{21} \end{pmatrix} \hat{H}^{11} \begin{pmatrix} I_p; -\hat{D}_{12}\hat{D}_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Thus,

$$n\hat{d}' \hat{H}^{-1} \hat{d} = n\hat{d}'_p \hat{H}^{11} \hat{d}_p = n\tilde{d}'_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \hat{\mathcal{V}} \tilde{d}_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \quad (\text{A.35})$$

However, under \mathcal{H}_{1A} , $\tilde{d}_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)$ is no longer evaluated at the true parameter value as $\alpha_0 \neq 0$. By MVT around α_0 , we can write

$$\tilde{d}_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) = \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - \frac{\partial \tilde{d}_U(\bar{\alpha}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)}{\partial \alpha} \alpha_0 \equiv \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - \tau, \quad (\text{A.36})$$

with $\bar{\alpha}$ being intermediate point such that $\|\bar{\alpha} - \alpha_0\| \leq \|\alpha_0\|$ and τ being the $(p+k+1) \times 1$ vector defined as

$$\tau = \frac{\partial \tilde{d}_U(\bar{\alpha}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)}{\partial \alpha} \alpha_0 = \frac{2}{n} U' P_Z \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_1(y) & \dots & \Upsilon_p(y) \end{pmatrix} \alpha_0 = \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{\Xi} \alpha_0. \quad (\text{A.37})$$

Similarly to (A.5) and (A.12),

$$\|\tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0)\| \leq K \|\hat{J}\| \|\hat{M}^{-1}\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' \epsilon \right\| + K \|\hat{J}\| \|\hat{M}^{-1}\| \left\| \frac{1}{n} Z' R \right\|$$

$$= O_p \left(\max \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}, p^{-\nu} \right) \right) = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \right) \quad (\text{A.38})$$

for ν satisfying $\sqrt{n}/p^{\nu+1/2} = o(1)$, which holds under Assumption 5, and $\|\tau\| = O_p(1)$ and non-zero, since $\alpha_0 \neq 0$.

We furthermore define the unconstrained version of \hat{H} evaluated at generic parameters' value as

$$\tilde{H}_U(\alpha, \lambda, \beta) = 4\hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1}\tilde{\Omega}_U(\alpha, \lambda, \beta)\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J}, \quad (\text{A.39})$$

partitioned in the usual way, where $\tilde{\Omega}_U$ is defined according to (4.10). We also define its limit quantity $H_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) = 4J'M^{-1}\Omega M^{-1}J$, where, as previously defined, $\Omega = n^{-1}\mathbb{E}(Z'\Sigma Z)$ and Σ the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with diagonal given by $\sigma_i^2, i = 1, \dots, n$. Similarly to what deduced in (A.13) and (A.14), under Assumptions 5-7, $\|\tilde{H}_U(\alpha, \lambda, \beta)\| = O_p(1)$, uniformly in (α, λ, β) and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig}(\tilde{H}_U(\alpha, \lambda, \beta)) > c > 0$, uniformly in (α, λ, β) and almost surely.

Clearly, $\hat{H} = \tilde{H}_U(0, \hat{\lambda}, \hat{\beta})$. We can apply the MVT to \hat{H}^{-1} around the true parameters' value and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}^{-1} &= \tilde{H}_U^{-1}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) + \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{H}_U^{-1}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta}) \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_U}{\partial \alpha_j} \Big|_{(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta})} \tilde{H}_U^{-1}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta}) \alpha_{0j} \\ &\quad - \sum_{t=1}^k \tilde{H}_U^{-1}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta}) \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_U}{\partial \beta_t} \Big|_{(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta})} \tilde{H}_U^{-1}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta}) (\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_{0t}) \\ &\quad - \tilde{H}_U^{-1}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta}) \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_U}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta})} \tilde{H}_U^{-1}(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta}) (\hat{\lambda} - \lambda_0) \equiv \tilde{H}_U^{-1}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) + T, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.40})$$

where $\bar{\alpha}$, $\bar{\beta}$ and $\bar{\lambda}$ are intermediate points such that $\|\bar{\alpha} - \alpha_0\| \leq \|\alpha_0\|$, $\|\bar{\beta} - \beta_0\| \leq \|\hat{\beta} - \beta_0\|$ and $|\bar{\lambda} - \lambda_0| \leq |\hat{\lambda} - \lambda_0|$. Under \mathcal{H}_{0A} , $\|T\| = O_p(\sqrt{p/n})$. Under \mathcal{H}_{1A} , $\alpha_{0j} \neq 0$ for some $j = 1, \dots, p$ and, since $\hat{\lambda}$ and $\hat{\beta}_t$ for $t = 1, \dots, k$ are restricted estimates, $\hat{\lambda} - \lambda_0 = O_p(1)$ and $\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_{0t} = O(1)$ for some $t = 1, \dots, k$. Thus, under Assumptions 5-7, $\|T\| = O_p(p)$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{eig}(T) > c > 0$. By partitioning T in the usual way, we obtain $\hat{H}^{11} = \tilde{H}_U^{11}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) + T_{11}$. Also, let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) = \begin{pmatrix} I_p \\ -\hat{D}_{22}^{-1} \hat{D}_{21} \end{pmatrix} \tilde{H}_U^{11}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \begin{pmatrix} I_p & ; & -\hat{D}_{12} \hat{D}_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.41})$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{W}} = \begin{pmatrix} I_p \\ -\hat{D}_{22}^{-1} \hat{D}_{21} \end{pmatrix} T_{11} \begin{pmatrix} I_p & ; & -\hat{D}_{12} \hat{D}_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.42})$$

From (A.36) and (A.40), (A.35) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
n\hat{d}'_p \hat{H}^{11} \hat{d}_p &= n\tilde{d}'_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) + 2n\tau' \tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \\
&\quad + n\tau' \tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \tau + n\tilde{d}'_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \tilde{\mathcal{W}} \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \\
&\quad + 2n\tau' \tilde{\mathcal{W}} \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) + n\tau' \tilde{\mathcal{W}} \tau,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.43}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{n\hat{d}'_p \hat{H}^{11} \hat{d}_p - p}{(2p)^{1/2}} &= \frac{n\tilde{d}'_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - p}{(2p)^{1/2}} \\
&\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2}n}{\sqrt{p}} \tau' \tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \\
&\quad + \frac{n}{\sqrt{2p}} \tau' \tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \tau + \frac{n}{\sqrt{2p}} \tilde{d}'_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \tilde{\mathcal{W}} \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \\
&\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2}n}{\sqrt{p}} \tau' \tilde{\mathcal{W}} \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) + \frac{n}{\sqrt{2p}} \tau' \tilde{\mathcal{W}} \tau
\end{aligned} \tag{A.44}$$

By a similar argument adopted in the proof of Theorem A1, we can show $\|\tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - d_U\| = O_p(p^{3/2}/n)$, with $d_U = -2/nJ'M^{-1}Z'\epsilon$ and $d_p = (I_p; -D_{12}D_{22}^{-1})d_U$. Also, we can show

$$\|\tilde{H}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - H_U\| = O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \tag{A.45}$$

such that, under Assumptions 5-7, $\|\tilde{H}_U^{11}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - H_U^{11}\| = O_p(p/\sqrt{n})$. We show the claim in (A.45) by routine arguments as in (A.21) and (A.22), after observing that $\tilde{H}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) = 4\hat{J}'\hat{M}^{-1}\tilde{\Omega}_R\hat{M}^{-1}\hat{J}$, with $\tilde{\Omega}_R = \tilde{\Omega} + \sum_{i=1}^p z_i z_i' R_i^2/n$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\Omega}_R - \Omega\| &\leq \|\tilde{\Omega} - \Omega\| + \left\| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^p z_i z_i' R_i^2}{n} \right\| = O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} R_i^2 \|\hat{M}\| \\
&= O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + O_p(p^{-2\nu}) = O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.46}$$

where the last equality follows for ν satisfying $\sqrt{n}/p^{2\nu+1} = o(1)$, which holds under Assumption 5.

After showing, similarly to what done in the proof of Theorem 1, that

$$\tilde{d}'_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - d'_p H_U^{11} d_p = o_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{p}}{n}\right), \tag{A.47}$$

we conclude that the first term in (A.44) is $O_p(1)$, as shown in Theorem 2. By standard norm inequalities, the second term in (A.44) is $O_p(\sqrt{n})$, the third is $O_p(n/\sqrt{p})$, the fourth is $O_p(p^{3/2})$, the fifth is $O_p(p\sqrt{n})$ and the sixth is $O_p(n\sqrt{p})$. The last term dominates the former five ones and thus, under \mathcal{H}_{1A} , for all $\eta > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{T}|^{-1} \leq \eta/n\sqrt{p}) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

and hence consistency of \mathcal{T} follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 3, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{d}_U(0_{p \times 1}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) &= \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - \frac{\partial \tilde{d}_U(\bar{\alpha}_n, \lambda_0, \beta_0)}{\partial \alpha} \alpha_{0n} \\ &= \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - \frac{\partial \tilde{d}_U(\bar{\alpha}_n, \lambda_0, \beta_0)}{\partial \alpha} \frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{n}} \delta,\end{aligned}\tag{A.48}$$

where we denote by α_{0n} the value of the $p \times 1$ vector α under \mathcal{H}_ℓ , $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_p)'$, $\|\bar{\alpha}_n - \alpha_{0n}\| \leq \|\alpha_{0n}\| \sim p^{1/4}/n$ since $\|\delta\| = 1$ and

$$\tau_n = \frac{\partial \tilde{d}_U(\bar{\alpha}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)}{\partial \alpha} \alpha_{0n} = \hat{J}' \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{\Xi} \frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{n}} \delta,\tag{A.49}$$

such that $\|\tau_n\| = O(p^{1/4}/\sqrt{n})$.

Also, by consistency of $(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\beta}')'$, under \mathcal{H}_l under Assumptions 2 and 5-7,

$$\hat{H} = \tilde{H}_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_U}{\partial \alpha_j} |_{(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta})} \alpha_{0n,j} + T_{1n},\tag{A.50}$$

with $\|T_{1n}\| = O_p(\sqrt{p/n})$. Let

$$T_{2n} = \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_U}{\partial \alpha_j} |_{(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta})} \alpha_{0n,j} = \frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_U}{\partial \alpha_j} |_{(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta})} \delta_j.\tag{A.51}$$

By standard norm inequalities, under Assumptions 5-7, we write

$$\|T_{2n}\| \leq \frac{p^{1/4}}{n^{1/2}} \sup_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left\| \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_U}{\partial \alpha_j} |_{(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta})} \right\| \sum_{j=1}^p |\delta_j| \leq \frac{p^{3/4}}{n^{1/2}} \sup_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left\| \frac{\partial \tilde{H}_U}{\partial \alpha_j} |_{(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\beta})} \right\| \|\delta\|^2 = O_p\left(\frac{p^{3/4}}{\sqrt{n}}\right).\tag{A.52}$$

Thus,

$$\|T_n\| \equiv \|T_{1n} + T_{2n}\| \leq \|T_{1n}\| + \|T_{2n}\| = O_p(p^{3/4}/\sqrt{n}).\tag{A.53}$$

Under \mathcal{H}_l , we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{H} - H_U\| &\leq \|\hat{H} - \tilde{H}_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)\| + \|\tilde{H}_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - H_U\| \\ &= O_p\left(\frac{p^{3/4}}{n}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = O_p\left(\frac{p}{\sqrt{n}}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{A.54}$$

where the first equality follows from (A.53) and (A.45). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n\hat{d}'_p \hat{H}^{11} \hat{d}_p - p}{(2p)^{1/2}} &= \frac{n\tilde{d}'_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \hat{\mathcal{V}}_n \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - p}{(2p)^{1/2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2n}}{\sqrt{p}} \tau'_n \hat{\mathcal{V}}_n \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) + \frac{n}{\sqrt{2p}} \tau'_n \hat{\mathcal{V}}_n \tau_n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.55})$$

After showing, by standard arguments and using (A.54),

$$\tilde{d}'_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0)' \hat{\mathcal{V}}_n \tilde{d}_U(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) - d'_p H_U^{11} d_p = o_p\left(\frac{\sqrt{p}}{n}\right), \quad (\text{A.56})$$

we conclude that the first term in (A.55) converges to $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The third term in (A.55) has a finite limit, since

$$\frac{n}{\sqrt{2p}} \tau'_n \hat{\mathcal{V}}_n(\alpha_{0n}, \lambda_0, \beta_0) \tau_n - \delta' \Xi' M^{-1} J \mathcal{V} J' M^{-1} \Xi \delta = o_p(1), \quad (\text{A.57})$$

where

$$\mathcal{V} = \begin{pmatrix} I_p \\ -D_{22}^{-1} D_{21} \end{pmatrix} H_U^{11} (I_p; -D_{12} D_{22}^{-1}) \quad (\text{A.58})$$

and $\delta' \Xi' M^{-1} J \mathcal{V} J' M^{-1} \Xi \delta \neq 0$ unless $\delta = 0$. The second term in (A.55) can be written as

$$\frac{\sqrt{2n}}{\sqrt{p}} \tau'_n \hat{\mathcal{V}}_n \tilde{d}_U = \frac{\sqrt{2n}}{\sqrt{p}} \tau'_n (\hat{\mathcal{V}}_n - \mathcal{V}) \tilde{d}_U + \frac{\sqrt{2n}}{\sqrt{p}} \tau'_n \mathcal{V} (\tilde{d}_U - d_U) + \frac{\sqrt{2n}}{\sqrt{p}} \tau'_n \mathcal{V} d_U. \quad (\text{A.59})$$

By routine arguments, the first two terms of last displayed expression are, respectively, $O_p(p^{5/4}/n^{1/2}) = o_p(1)$ and $O_p(p^{3/4}/n^{1/2})$, and are thus $o_p(1)$ as long as $p^3/n = o(1)$. The third term in (A.59) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\sqrt{2n}^{1/2}}{p^{1/4}} \delta' (\hat{\Xi}' - \Xi') \hat{M}^{-1} \hat{J} \mathcal{V} d_U + \frac{\sqrt{2n}^{1/2}}{p^{1/4}} \delta' \Xi' (\hat{M}^{-1} - M^{-1}) \hat{J} \mathcal{V} d_U \\ &\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2n}^{1/2}}{p^{1/4}} \delta' \Xi' M^{-1} (\hat{J} - J) \mathcal{V} d_U + \frac{\sqrt{2n}^{1/2}}{p^{1/4}} \delta' \Xi' M^{-1} J \mathcal{V} d_U. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.60})$$

By routine arguments adopted throughout the proofs, the first three terms in (A.60) are $O_p(p^{5/4}/n^{1/2}) = o_p(1)$. The last term in (A.60) has mean zero and variance bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &K \frac{1}{p^{1/2}} \delta' \Xi' M^{-1} J \mathcal{V} J' M^{-1} \Omega M^{-1} J \mathcal{V} J' M^{-1} \Xi \delta \leq K \frac{1}{p^{1/2}} \|\delta\|^2 \|\Xi\|^2 \|J\|^4 \|M^{-1}\|^4 \|\mathcal{V}\|^2 \|\Omega\| \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{p^{1/2}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.61})$$

such that the last term in (A.60) is $O_p(1/p^{1/4})$. Hence, the second term in (A.59) is

$O_p(1/p^{1/4}) = o_p(1)$ since $p \rightarrow \infty$, concluding the claim as

$$\frac{n\hat{d}'_p \hat{H}^{11} \hat{d}_p - p}{\sqrt{2p}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\varrho, 1), \quad (\text{A.62})$$

with $\varrho = \delta' \Xi' M^{-1} J \mathcal{V} J' M^{-1} \Xi \delta$. □

References

- Acemoglu, D., A. Ozdaglar, and A. Tahbaz-Salehi (2016). Networks, shocks, and systemic risk. In Y. Bramoullé, A. Galeotti, and B. Rogers (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Economics of Networks*, pp. 569–608. Oxford University Press.
- Allen, F. and D. Gale (2000). Financial contagion. *Journal of Political Economy* 108, 1–33.
- Allers, M. and J. P. Elhorst (2005). Tax mimicking and yardstick competition among local governments in the Netherlands. *International Tax and Public Finance* 12, 493–513.
- Arraiz, I., D. M. Drukker, H. H. Kelejian, and I. R. Prucha (2010). A spatial Cliff-Ord-type model with heteroskedastic innovations: Small and large sample results. *Journal of Regional Science* 50, 592–614.
- Ballester, C., A. Calvó-Armengol, and Y. Zenou (2006). Who’s who in networks. Wanted: The key player. *Econometrica* 74, 1403–1417.
- Blume, L. E., W. A. Brock, S. N. Durlauf, and Y. M. Ioannides (2011). Identification of Social Interactions. In J. Benhabib, A. Bisin, and M. O. Jackson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Economics*, Volume 1, pp. 853–964. North-Holland.
- Bramoullé, Y. and R. Kranton (2007). Public goods in networks. *Journal of Economic Theory* 135, 478–494.
- Bramoullé, Y., R. Kranton, and M. D’Amours (2014). Strategic interaction and networks. *American Economic Review* 104, 898–930.
- Calvó-Armengol, A., E. Patacchini, and Y. Zenou (2009). Peer effects and social networks in education. *The Review of Economic Studies* 76, 1239–1267.
- Chen, X. (2007). *Large sample sieve estimation of semi-nonparametric models*, In: *Handbook of Econometrics*, Volume 6B, Chapter 76, pp. 5549–5632. North Holland.
- Cliff, A. D. and J. K. Ord (1973). *Spatial Autocorrelation*. London: Pion.
- Cliff, A. D. and K. J. Ord (1968). The problem of spatial autocorrelation. *Joint Discussion Paper, University of Bristol: Department of Economics, Department of Geography, Series A 15*, i–88.
- de Jong, R. M. and H. J. Bierens (1994). On the limit behavior of a Chi-square type test if the number of conditional moments tested approaches infinity. *Econometric Theory* 10, 70–90.

- de Paula, Á. (2017). Econometrics of Network Models. In B. Honoré, A. Pakes, M. Piazzesi, and L. Samuelson (Eds.), *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Eleventh World Congress*, Volume 1 of *Econometric Society Monographs*, pp. 268—323. Cambridge University Press.
- Devereux, M. P., B. Lockwood, and M. Redoano (2007). Horizontal and vertical indirect tax competition: Theory and some evidence from the USA. *Journal of Public Economics* 91, 451–479.
- Devereux, M. P., B. Lockwood, and M. Redoano (2008). Do countries compete over corporate tax rates? *Journal of Public Economics* 92, 1210–1235.
- Donald, S. G., G. W. Imbens, and W. K. Newey (2003). Empirical likelihood estimation and consistent tests with conditional moment restrictions. *Journal of Econometrics* 117, 55–93.
- Gupta, A. (2018). Nonparametric specification testing via the trinity of tests. *Journal of Econometrics* 203, 169–185.
- Gupta, A. and X. Qu (2024). Consistent specification testing under spatial dependence. *Econometric Theory* 40, 278–319.
- Gupta, A. and M. H. Seo (2023). Robust inference on infinite and growing dimensional time-series regression. *Econometrica* 91, 1333–1361.
- Hong, Y. and H. White (1995). Consistent specification testing via nonparametric series regression. *Econometrica* 63, 1133–1159.
- Hoshino, T. (2022). Sieve IV estimation of cross-sectional interaction models with nonparametric endogenous effect. *Journal of Econometrics* 229, 263–275.
- Jenish, N. (2016). Spatial semiparametric model with endogenous regressors. *Econometric Theory* 32, 714–739.
- Jenish, N. and I. R. Prucha (2009). Central limit theorems and uniform laws of large numbers for arrays of random fields. *Journal of Econometrics* 150, 86–98.
- Jenish, N. and I. R. Prucha (2012). On spatial processes and asymptotic inference under near-epoch dependence. *Journal of Econometrics* 170, 178 – 190.
- Kanbur, R. and M. Keen (1993). Jeux sans frontières: Tax competition and tax coordination when countries differ in size. *American Economic Review* 83, 877–892.

- Kelejian, H. H. and I. R. Prucha (1998). A generalized spatial two-stage least squares procedure for estimating a spatial autoregressive model with autoregressive disturbances. *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 17, 99–121.
- Kelejian, H. H. and I. R. Prucha (2010). Specification and estimation of spatial autoregressive models with autoregressive and heteroskedastic disturbances. *Journal of Econometrics* 157, 53–67.
- König, M. D., D. Rohner, M. Thoenig, and F. Zilibotti (2017). Networks in conflict: Theory and evidence from the Great War of Africa. *Econometrica* 85, 1093–1132.
- Korolev, I. (2019). A consistent heteroskedasticity robust LM type specification test for semiparametric models. arXiv:1810.07620v3.
- Lee, J., P. C. B. Phillips, and F. Rossi (2020). Consistent misspecification testing in spatial autoregressive models. Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper no. 2256.
- Lee, J. and P. M. Robinson (2016). Series estimation under cross-sectional dependence. *Journal of Econometrics* 190, 1–17.
- Lee, L. F. (2002). Consistency and efficiency of least squares estimation for mixed regressive, spatial autoregressive models. *Econometric Theory* 18, 252–277.
- Lee, L. F. (2004). Asymptotic distributions of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators for spatial autoregressive models. *Econometrica* 72, 1899–1925.
- Lyytikäinen, T. (2012). Tax competition among local governments: Evidence from a property tax reform in Finland. *Journal of Public Economics* 96, 584–595.
- Malikov, E. and Y. Sun (2017). Semiparametric estimation and testing of smooth coefficient spatial autoregressive models. *Journal of Econometrics* 199, 12–34.
- Pinkse, J. and M. E. Slade (2010). The future of spatial econometrics. *Journal of Regional Science* 50, 103–117.
- Redoano, M. (2014). Tax competition among European countries. Does the EU matter? *European Journal of Political Economy* 34, 353–371.
- Robinson, P. M. (2008). Correlation testing in time series, spatial and cross-sectional data. *Journal of Econometrics* 147, 5–16.
- Su, L. and X. Qu (2017). Specification test for spatial autoregressive models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 35, 572–584.
- Tincani, M. (2018). Heterogenous peer effects in the classroom. Working Paper.

Tullock, G. (1980). Efficient rent seeking. In J. Buchanan, R. Tollison, and G. Tullock (Eds.), *Toward a Theory of the Rent-Seeking Society*. Texas A&M University Press.