

# Parameter Estimation for Partially Observed Affine and Polynomial Processes

Jan Kallsen   Ivo Richert  
Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel\*

## Abstract

This paper is devoted to parameter estimation for partially observed polynomial state space models. This class includes discretely observed affine or more generally polynomial Markov processes. The polynomial structure allows for the explicit computation of a Gaussian quasi-likelihood estimator and its asymptotic covariance matrix. We show consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimating sequence and provide explicitly computable expressions for the corresponding asymptotic covariance matrix.

Key words: polynomial processes, polynomial state space models, parameter estimation, quasi-maximum likelihood estimation, affine processes, filtering

MSC (2020) subject classification: 62M05, 62M12

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The setup</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Parametric polynomial state space models . . . . .	6
2.2	Gaussian quasi-likelihood estimation . . . . .	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Main results</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1	Consistency and asymptotic normality . . . . .	13
3.2	Estimation of the asymptotic covariance matrix . . . . .	13
3.3	Explicit computation of the asymptotic covariance matrix . . . . .	17
3.4	Asymptotic confidence intervals and tests . . . . .	20
<b>4</b>	<b>Examples</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1	The Heston stochastic volatility model . . . . .	21
4.2	Multivariate Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes . . . . .	28

---

\*Mathematisches Seminar, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Heinrich-Hecht-Platz 6, 24118 Kiel, Germany, Email: kallsen@math.uni-kiel.de, richert@math.uni-kiel.de

<b>5</b>	<b>Proofs</b>	<b>34</b>
5.1	Proofs for Section 2 . . . . .	34
5.2	Proofs for Section 3.1 . . . . .	36
5.2.1	A functional central limit theorem for the quasi-score process . . . . .	37
5.2.2	A law of large numbers for the observed Fisher information . . . . .	48
5.2.3	Proof of consistency and asymptotic normality . . . . .	54
5.3	Proofs for Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 . . . . .	60
5.4	Proofs for Section 4 . . . . .	63
<b>A</b>	<b>Tools</b>	<b>64</b>
A.1	Ergodic theorems for Markov chains . . . . .	64
A.2	Results from matrix analysis and linear systems theory . . . . .	66
A.3	Results from probability theory and analysis . . . . .	72
	<b>References</b>	<b>81</b>

## 1 Introduction

In light of their computational tractability and their flexibility in modelling empirical properties of common financial time series, the class of *affine processes* has become one of the most prominently used stochastic models in modern financial mathematics. Affine processes are continuous-time Markovian semimartingales whose characteristic function features an exponential-affine dependence on the initial state vector of the process. First studied in the 1970s in the form of continuous-time limits of Galton–Watson branching processes with immigration in Kawazu and Watanabe [74], affine processes have henceforth appeared in many financial applications, including the classic interest rate models of Vašíček [111] or Cox, Ingersoll and Ross [28], the popular stochastic volatility model of Heston [63], or the broad class of affine jump-diffusions introduced by Duffie, Pan and Singleton [41]. In addition, the affine class nests both the class of Lévy processes as well as the class of Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes. Finally, in 2003 affine processes were systematically characterised by Duffie, Filipović and Schachermayer [40], combining the two predominantly studied types of processes from Kawazu and Watanabe [74] and Duffie et al. [41] in a single broad framework.

The family of affine processes features the convenient property that higher order conditional moments can be expressed by polynomials of the same order in the current state vector. Driven by this observation, the class of affine processes has been subsequently generalised to the broader class of *polynomial processes*, which is defined by this very property and which first appeared by name in Cuchiero [29] and Cuchiero et al. [31] although the application of polynomial processes in financial modelling dates back at least to the early 2000s with the works of Delbaen and Shirakawa [35] and Zhou [115]. From a practical point of view, polynomial processes become inherently tractable once their infinitesimal generator or their semimartingale characteristics have been specified because the computation of higher-order moments then only requires the simple computation of matrix exponentials. This convenient property also carries over to the computation of joint moments at multiple points in time, see Benth and Lavagnini [17].

Apart from the affine subclass, polynomial processes cover for example the family of Pearson diffusions, which are easily able to model non-trivial dynamics on compact state spaces, or the class of Generalised Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes, which have been applied in financial mathematics e.g. in the context of the COGARCH model of Klüppelberg et al. [76]. Other examples of the vast applications of polynomial processes in finance include interest rate theory (Delbaen and Shirakawa [35], Filipović and Willems [55] or Zhou [115]), stochastic volatility and option pricing models (Akerer et al. [2]), credit risk theory (Akerer and Filipović [1]), life insurance liability (Biagini and Zhang [19]), energy commodity market models (Kleisinger-Yu et al. [75] or Ware [113]), variance swaps (Filipović et al. [51]), and stochastic portfolio theory (Cuchiero [30]). Most examples of polynomial processes in the aforementioned applications can be subsumed in the simpler classes of *polynomial diffusions* or *polynomial jump-diffusions* introduced in Filipović and Larsson [52] and Filipović and Larsson [53], respectively. For definitions and important properties of affine and polynomial processes we refer to Eberlein and Kallsen [44].

From the point of view of these applications, it is inevitable to statistically estimate the underlying parameters of the corresponding parameterised polynomial process. Given the necessity of this task, it is rather surprising that the availability of literature concerning the general estimation of parameterised polynomial processes is sparse. Many of the aforementioned applications establish certain parameter estimation methods that are specifically tailored to the particular employed example of a polynomial process instead of deriving general estimation methods that only use the affine or polynomial structure of the Markov process. The aim of this paper is to close this gap and provide a general framework for the estimation of polynomial – and hence also of affine – processes observed at discrete points in time. In particular, we study the asymptotic properties of our estimators if the length of the observation period tends to infinity. The interval between observations, however, is supposed to be fixed.

The most prominent methods for estimating particular examples of polynomial processes include the maximum likelihood estimation methodology (see for example Ware [113] for an exact likelihood estimation of the Jacobi process) or a classical least-squares minimisation between simulated model quantities and quantities observed on the market, as it is done for example in Akerer and Filipović [1] or Filipović and Willems [55]. Our paper is devoted to an estimation under the “true” physical rather than an equivalent risk-neutral measure, so we will not further discuss any least-squares calibration procedures here. Instead, our main focus is the estimation of parameters using quasi-maximum likelihood (QML) procedures. If the underlying polynomial process is of diffusion-type and observed continuously in time, exact expressions for the likelihood of the process can be obtained by absolutely continuous changes of measure (see for example Basawa and Prakasa Rao [12]) or by infinitesimal-time expansions of the transition dynamics (see for example Azencott [10]). If, on the other hand, the process is sampled only at discrete times, exact representations of the likelihood often become unavailable and have to be approximated as for example in Ait-Sahalia [3] or Filipović et al. [54]. Usually, however, not even all components of the underlying process are observable for estimation, which renders even these procedures infeasible. This happens for example in stochastic volatility models or in latent-factor interest rate models. In this case, parameter estimation effectively involves a stochastic filtering problem.

In this study we tackle estimation in the context of partial observations by first deriving a canonical discrete-time representation of polynomial processes in the form of a potentially

higher-dimensional vector-autoregressive model of order one, and then approximating this representation by a Gaussian process with matched first and second moments. This Gaussian process is used as a proxy of the true underlying polynomial process in a classical maximum likelihood procedure. In particular, this allows to express the likelihood function of the observed parts in terms of a Kálmán filter for the latent components. Since this likelihood depends on the underlying process only through its first and second moments, the resulting QML estimator can be interpreted in the widest sense as some kind of generalised method of moments (GMM) approach. We prove that, under some mild conditions on the transition dynamics of the model, our estimator is weakly consistent and asymptotically normal. In addition, we derive an explicit representation of the asymptotic covariance matrix of the QML estimator which can be used for constructing asymptotic confidence intervals or rejection regions of hypothesis tests. Concerning the parameter estimation of polynomial processes from the applications mentioned above, our methodology is best comparable with that of Bigini and Zhang [19], who are however not concerned with the statistical properties of their obtained QML estimator.

As already mentioned, our canonical representation of a polynomial process is that of a vector-autoregressive model, which is itself a special case of a general vector-autoregressive moving average (VARMA) model. In this sense, our results can be seen as a specific application of the general, conceptually rich literature on maximum likelihood estimation of VARMA models. Consistency and asymptotic normality of QML estimators of VARMA models (however with homoskedastic noise) have been shown before for example by Boubacar Mainassara and Francq [26] and by Dunsmuir and Hannan [42] in the case of fully observed processes and by Schlemm and Stelzer [100] covering the case of partial observations. The key difference between these studies and our results lies in the fact that due to our added Markovian structure and the availability of explicit polynomial moments, we are able to provide a closed-form representation of the asymptotic covariance matrix and to considerably simplify the required assumptions on the underlying process.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the setup for our estimation problem, in particular the notion of a parametric polynomial state space model and the corresponding quasi-likelihood. The main results on consistency and asymptotic normality are to be found in Section 3. Subsequently, we apply our results to the popular Heston stochastic volatility model from finance and to Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck models. The proofs of the main results are to be found in Section 5. The appendix provides some technical tools that are needed in different parts of the paper.

## Frequently used notation throughout the paper

We finish this section by introducing and recalling the basic notation and some theoretical preliminaries. Throughout, we let  $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  denote the set of natural numbers including 0 and  $\mathbb{N}^* := \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ . For any space  $E$  we let  $\text{id}$  denote the identity map on  $E$  and  $\mathcal{P}(E)$  the power set of  $E$ . For a multi-index  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we write  $|\lambda| = \sum_{j=1}^d \lambda_j$  and  $x^\lambda := \prod_{j=1}^d x_j^{\lambda_j}$ . The notation  $\mathbb{N}_k^d$  stands for the set of all multi-indices  $\lambda$  with  $|\lambda| \leq k$ . For  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{N}^d$  we write  $\lambda \leq \mu$  if  $\mu - \lambda \in \mathbb{N}^d$  and in this case we set  $\binom{\lambda}{\mu} := \prod_{j=1}^d \binom{\lambda_j}{\mu_j}$ . The notation  $\mathbf{1}_j \in \mathbb{N}^d$  is used for the multi-index containing only zeros except of a one in the  $j$ -th entry and by convention, we set  $\mathbf{0} := (0, \dots, 0)$ . If  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , we say that  $g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a polynomial of order  $p$  if it is of the form  $g(x) = \sum_{|\lambda| \leq p} \alpha_\lambda x^\lambda$  for some  $\alpha_\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We denote the

set of all such polynomials up to order  $p$  by  $\mathcal{P}_p(E)$ . Additionally, we say that  $g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  is a  $k$ -dimensional polynomial of order  $p$  if each component  $g_i \in \mathcal{P}_p(E)$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

When working on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  we assume that it has been endowed with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . For any  $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we write  $\lambda_d$  for the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathcal{B}(E)$ . If  $j$  denotes the Hausdorff dimension of  $E$ , we write  $\lambda_E$  for the  $j$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure on  $\mathcal{B}(E)$ . This concept extends the notion of a  $j$ -dimensional volume to arbitrary Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that have topological dimension strictly less than  $d$ . Since  $j$  is the unique integer  $k$  such that  $\lambda_k(E)$  has a finite non-zero value, we call  $\lambda_E$  the proper Hausdorff measure on  $E$ .

We let  $I_d$  stand for the identity matrix in  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Whenever the dimension  $d$  is unambiguous, we just write  $I$  instead of  $I_d$  and whenever the underlying space  $\mathbb{R}^m$  or  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is unambiguous, we let  $0$  stand for the respective zero vector or zero matrix. Moreover,  $e_j^{(k)}$  denotes the  $j$ -th unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  for  $j, k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . If  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , we let  $\text{diag}_k(A)$  denote the  $(kd \times kd)$ -block matrix that contains the matrix  $A$  on the diagonal blocks and elsewhere  $0$ . For any matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , we write  $\rho(A)$  for the spectral radius of  $A$ , i.e.  $\rho(A) = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} |\lambda_i(A)|$  with  $\lambda_i(A)$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , denoting the eigenvalues of  $A$ . Moreover, we let  $\alpha(A)$  stand for the spectral abscissa of  $A$ , i.e.  $\alpha(A) = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \text{Re}(\lambda_i(A))$ . In multiple occasions, we will use matrix products of the form  $\prod_{m=1}^n A_m$  for conformable matrices  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ . In any of these situations the product is to be read from right to left, that is,  $\prod_{m=1}^n A_m := A_n A_{n-1} \dots A_1$ . For some  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and if not specified any further, we let  $\|x\|$  stand for the Euclidean norm of  $x$  and  $\|A\|$  stand for the spectral norm of  $A$ , i.e.  $\|A\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} \|Ax\|$ . In particular,  $\|A\|$  is given by the largest singular value of  $A$  and  $\|A\| = \rho(A)$  if  $A$  is symmetric. If  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is any square matrix, we let  $\text{Sym}(A) := A + A^\top$  denote its symmetrisation.

We say that a sequence  $(a_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  in a normed space  $E$  converges to  $a \in E$  at a *geometric rate* if there are  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  with  $\|a_t - a\| \leq c\gamma^t$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Uniform convergence at a geometric rate of functions  $f : E \rightarrow F$  with a normed space  $F$  is defined analogously.

We let  $C(E, F)$  denote the space of continuous functions  $E \rightarrow F$  for topological spaces  $E$  and  $F$ . If moreover  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $F \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , we let  $C^m(E, F)$  denote the space of  $m$ -times continuously differentiable functions  $E \rightarrow F$ . If  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $f \in C^1(E, \mathbb{R})$ , we write  $\partial_{x_j} f$  for  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}$  and we let  $\nabla_x f := (\partial_{x_1} f, \dots, \partial_{x_k} f)^\top$  stand for the gradient of  $f$ . If  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$  is a multi-index, the operator  $\partial_x^\alpha$  is used as a shorthand for  $\partial_{x_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial_{x_k}^{\alpha_k}$ . We let  $\nabla_x^2 f$  stand for the  $(k \times k)$  Hessian matrix of  $f \in C^2(E, \mathbb{R})$ . If  $f \in C^1(E, \mathbb{R}^d)$ , we write  $\nabla_x f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$  to denote the Jacobian matrix of  $f$ .

Let  $E$  be a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We call  $E$  a *proper state space* if  $E$  is a closed and connected smooth manifold, contains  $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and is not contained in any proper linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The assumption that  $E$  is a smooth manifold ensures that the Hausdorff dimension of  $E$  is an integer and coincides with the topological covering dimension of  $E$ , which will be needed later.

Since we make heavy use of the Kronecker product, we recall its basic properties here. For  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$  the Kronecker product  $A \otimes B \in \mathbb{R}^{mp \times nq}$  is defined as the block matrix

$$A \otimes B := \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}B & \dots & A_{1n}B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{n1}B & \dots & A_{nn}B \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this sense, the Kronecker product is a non-commutative, associative bilinear map  $\otimes : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{p \times q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{mp \times nq}$ . We define the Kronecker product for vectors  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  by interpreting  $x$  as an element of  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ . The Kronecker product shares a distributivity property with the matrix product in the sense that  $(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = (AC) \otimes (BD)$  for any matrices  $A, B, C, D$

of conformable size. The Kronecker product gets along well with the vectorisation operator  $\text{vec} : \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{mn}$  that stacks the columns of a matrix on top of each other. Indeed, we have  $(A \otimes B)\text{vec}(C) = \text{vec}(BCA^\top)$ . This implies that  $\text{vec}(xy^\top) = y \otimes x$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . By associativity, we can also consider repeated Kronecker multiplication and we will write  $A^{\otimes n}$  for the  $n$ -fold repeated Kronecker product  $A \otimes \cdots \otimes A$ .

The Kronecker product commutes with the operations of transposing and inverting matrices in the sense that  $(A \otimes B)^\top = A^\top \otimes B^\top$  and  $(A \otimes B)^+ = A^+ \otimes B^+$ , where  $+$  denotes the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse. If  $A$  and  $B$  are square matrices with respective spectrum  $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\}, \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\} \subset \mathbb{C}$ , then  $A \otimes B$  has the spectrum  $\{\lambda_i \mu_j : i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ . It follows that  $\rho(A \otimes B) = \rho(A)\rho(B)$ . Additionally, one has  $\|A \otimes B\| = \|A\| \cdot \|B\|$  for any matrix norm  $\|\cdot\|$  induced by a vector  $p$ -norm, see Theorem 8 and the notes on page 413 in Lancaster and Farahat [77]. Sometimes, it is convenient to define the Kronecker sum  $A \oplus B \in \mathbb{R}^{mp \times np}$  for matrices  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$  such that  $np = mq$  by  $A \oplus B := I_p \otimes A + B \otimes I_m$ . This has the advantage that it behaves well in conjunction with matrix exponentials since  $e^A \otimes e^B = e^{A \oplus B}$  for square matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , see Neudecker [86]. Finally, if  $A : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $B : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$  are continuously differentiable matrix-valued functions on some subset  $E$  of  $\mathbb{R}$ , then one has the convenient Kronecker product rule  $\partial_x [A(x) \otimes B(x)] = [\partial_x A(x)] \otimes B(x) + A(x) \otimes [\partial_x B(x)]$ .

Further unexplained notation concerning in particular probability theory, stochastic processes, Markov processes and semimartingales is used as in Jacod and Shiryaev [69], Eberlein and Kallsen [44], Meyn and Tweedie [85], Ethier and Kurtz [47].

## 2 The setup

As noted in the introduction, the present paper is devoted to estimating an unknown parameter  $\theta \in \Theta$  of the law of an affine or polynomial process that is sampled at discrete time points. More specifically, our setup deals with the case of *partial observations* in the sense that only a subset of the coordinates of the multi-dimensional process is actually available for parameter estimation. We start by introducing a flexible discrete-time stochastic framework termed *parametric polynomial state space model*, which naturally generalises the concept of a discretely sampled polynomial process. Since the likelihood of the observed part of the polynomial process is generally unknown in closed form, it is approximated by the likelihood of a Gaussian process with the same first and second moments. Consistency and asymptotic normality of the so-obtained QML estimator is stated in Section 3 under suitable ergodicity assumptions on the polynomial process.

### 2.1 Parametric polynomial state space models

We fix some filtered space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}})$  along with some  $E$ -valued adapted process  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  on this space, where  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  denotes a proper state space. The following definition is inspired by Definition 2.8 in Kallsen and Richert [73].

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^k$  denote a compact convex set and  $(\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$  a family of probability measures on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ . We call  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  a **parametric polynomial state space model of order 1** if the following holds.*

1.  $X$  is a Markov chain with respect to any  $\mathbb{P}_\theta, \theta \in \Theta$ . We denote the corresponding one-step

transition probabilities by  $P_\theta(x, \cdot)$  for  $x \in E$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{P}_\theta(X(t) \in B | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = P_\theta(X(t-1), B)$  holds  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ -almost surely for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ .

2.  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\|X(t)\|) < \infty$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

3. For any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  we have

$$X(t) = a^\theta + A^\theta X(t-1) + N^\theta(t) \quad (2.1)$$

with some deterministic  $a^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $A^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and some  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ -martingale difference sequence  $N^\theta = (N^\theta(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(N^\theta(t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = 0$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . We call  $A^\theta$  the **state transition matrix** and  $a^\theta$  the **state transition vector** of  $X$ . We write  $C^\theta(t) := \text{Cov}_\theta(N^\theta(t))$  for the unconditional covariance matrix under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  if second moments exist.

If the state space  $E$  is degenerate,  $A^\theta$  above may not be uniquely specified. We will later always choose one possible matrix  $A^\theta$  with  $\rho(A^\theta) < 1$ , see Proposition 2.12.

In analogy to polynomial processes, we will now develop the notion of higher-order polynomial state space models. It is the translation of the corresponding Definition 2.9 in Kallsen and Richert [73] to our parametric Markovian setup.

**Definition 2.2.** We call  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  a **parametric polynomial state space model of order**  $r \in \mathbb{N}^*$  if  $((X^\lambda)_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_t^d \setminus \{0\}}, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  or, equivalently,  $(\text{vec}_{\otimes r}(X), (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  is a parametric polynomial state space model of order 1 for  $\ell = 1, \dots, r$ , where  $\text{vec}_{\otimes r}(X) := (X, X \otimes X, \dots, X^{\otimes r})$  denotes the  $\ell$ -fold stacked Kronecker product of  $X$  which contains all powers up to order  $\ell$  of the elements of  $X$  (with some entries occurring multiple times).

**Remark 2.3.** As observed in Proposition 2.11 of Kallsen and Richert [73], polynomial state space models satisfy a moment formula similar to the one for polynomial processes in continuous time. Indeed, if  $a_{\otimes r}^\theta$  and  $A_{\otimes r}^\theta$  respectively denote the state transition vector and state transition matrix of  $\text{vec}_{\otimes r}(X)$  relative to  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , then a simple recursion shows that

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta[\text{vec}_{\otimes r}(X(t)) | \mathcal{F}_s] = (A_{\otimes r}^\theta)^{t-s} \text{vec}_{\otimes r}(X(s)) + \left( \sum_{u=0}^{t-s-1} (A_{\otimes r}^\theta)^u \right) a_{\otimes r}^\theta \quad (2.2)$$

for any  $\theta \in \Theta$  and any  $s, t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $s \leq t$ . In particular, since by definition  $X$  is also polynomial of all orders  $\ell$  less than  $r$ , it follows that the matrix  $A_{\otimes r}^\theta$  has the general block triangular form

$$A_{\otimes r}^\theta = \begin{pmatrix} A^\theta & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \circ & \circ & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \circ & \circ & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \circ & 0 \\ \circ & \circ & \dots & & \circ \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $0$  stands for a zero matrix of appropriate size and  $\circ$  for some matrix of appropriate size. Equation (2.2) can be written in a more concise way as a simple matrix product by  $\mathbb{E}_\theta[\widetilde{\text{vec}}_{\otimes r}(X(t)) | \mathcal{F}_s] = (\widetilde{B}_{\otimes r}^\theta)^{t-s} \widetilde{\text{vec}}_{\otimes r}(X(s))$  for  $s, t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,  $s \leq t$ , where we define

$$\widetilde{\text{vec}}_{\otimes r}(X(t)) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \text{vec}_{\otimes r}(X(t)) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{B}_{\otimes r}^\theta := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ a_{\otimes r}^\theta & A_{\otimes r}^\theta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.3)$$

Here,  $\widetilde{B}_{\otimes r}^\theta$  is the natural analogue of the matrix exponential in the moment formula for polynomial processes in continuous time and of the matrix  $\widetilde{B}$  from Lemma 2.15 of Kallsen and Richert [73]. Similar formulas hold for  $(X^\lambda)_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_t^d \setminus \{0\}}$  in place of  $\text{vec}_{\otimes r}(X)$ .

**Remark 2.4.** The state space model (2.1) is a particular case of a vector-autoregressive moving average (VARMA) model. A VARMA( $p, q$ ) model is an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued process  $(X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfying

$$A_0 X(t) - \sum_{i=1}^p A_i X(t-i) = B_0 \varepsilon(t) - \sum_{i=1}^q B_i \varepsilon(t-i)$$

for some matrices  $A_i, B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and where  $(\varepsilon(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an uncorrelated sequence of mean-zero variables. As noted in the introduction, consistency and asymptotic normality for QML estimators of VARMA models (however with homoskedastic noise sequence) have been shown before for example in Boubacar Maïnassara and Francq [26] or Dunsmuir and Hannan [42]. The key difference between the polynomial state space model and the VARMA model lies in the fact that due to the Markovian nature and the computability of polynomial moments explicit expressions for the estimator's asymptotic covariance matrix can be obtained in our setup.

**Example 2.5.** If  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is obtained by sampling an  $r$ -polynomial process  $(X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  at non-negative integer time points, then it is a polynomial state space model by Lemma 2.15 in Kallsen and Richert [73]. Conversely, however, there need not be an obvious choice of a continuous-time polynomial process from which  $X$  is obtained by discrete sampling. One such example is the GARCH(1, 1) model  $(y(t), \sigma^2(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  of Bollerslev [22] specified by

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) &= \omega_0 + \sigma(t)\varepsilon(t), \\ \sigma^2(t) &= \omega + \alpha y(t-1)^2 + \beta \sigma^2(t-1), \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  for some  $\omega_0, \omega > 0, \alpha, \beta \geq 0$  and some adapted i.i.d. sequence  $(\varepsilon(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\varepsilon(t)$  being independent of  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . It is not hard to see that  $(y(t)^2, \sigma^2(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a polynomial state space model of order  $r$  as long as  $\varepsilon$  has finite moments of order  $r$ .

As already noted, proper maximum likelihood estimation of the parameter  $\theta$  of a polynomial state space model is often infeasible in practice because the likelihood of the model is not known in closed form. We propose here to approximate the unknown likelihood by that of a Gaussian vector-autoregressive process whose first and second moments are matched with those of the given polynomial process. The existence of such a Gaussian equivalent is assured by the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.6.** *Consider a polynomial state space model  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  of order 1 with finite second moments and state transition vector and matrix  $a^\theta$  and  $A^\theta$ . Let  $Y = (Y(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  denote an adapted  $E$ -valued process on some filtered space  $(\Gamma, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}})$  and  $(\mathbb{Q}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$  a family of probability measures on that space such that*

$$Y(t) = a^\theta + A^\theta Y(t-1) + B^\theta(t)W^\theta(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad (2.4)$$

where

1.  $Y(0)$  is Gaussian under  $\mathbb{Q}_\theta$  with the same mean and covariance matrix as  $X(0)$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ ,
2.  $B^\theta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is deterministic and satisfies  $B^\theta(t)B^\theta(t)^\top = C^\theta(t)$  for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,
3.  $W^\theta(t)$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued standard Gaussian random variable under  $\mathbb{Q}_\theta$ , independent of  $\mathcal{G}_{t-1}$ .



Then  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t)) = \mathbb{E}_\theta(Y(t))$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t)X(s)^\top) = \mathbb{E}_\theta(Y(t)Y(s)^\top)$  for any  $s, t \in \mathbb{N}$ . We call  $(Y, (\mathbb{Q}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  the **Gaussian equivalent** of the polynomial state space model  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$ .

- Remark 2.7.**
1. It is easy to see that  $Y$  in Proposition 2.6 is a Gaussian process under any  $\mathbb{Q}_\theta$  and hence its law is uniquely determined by the first and second moments.
  2. Strictly speaking, Proposition 2.6 does not claim that this Gaussian equivalent actually exists. But this is verified easily by choosing  $(\Gamma, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}})$  to be the canonical state space,  $Y$  the canonical process on this space, and  $\mathbb{Q}_\theta$  as the Gaussian law with the desired first and second moments.
  3. Since  $N^\theta(t)$  is in general not independent of  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ , the conditional second moments of  $X$  and  $Y$  can differ substantially. In particular,  $Y$  is in general not a (time-homogeneous) Markov chain because its transition function depends on  $t$  through  $B^\theta(t)$ .
  4. Contrary to what Proposition 2.6 suggests, our approach heavily relies on higher-order polynomial models. Firstly, an order 2 resp. 4 is needed for the asymptotic theory contained in the following chapters and in particular for the computation of the asymptotic covariance matrix. But just as importantly, first and second moments of the original process are typically not enough to estimate high-dimensional parameter vectors of a polynomial process. Instead, we will later consider the Gaussian equivalent of the higher-dimensional extension  $((X^\lambda)_{\lambda \in L}, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  from Definition 2.2 for some suitable subset  $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}_r^d \setminus \{0\}$ , whose first and second moments carry enough information to estimate the unknown model parameters. For concrete examples we refer to Section 4.

By slight abuse of notation, we write  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}})$  and  $(\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$  instead of  $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}})$  and  $(\mathbb{Q}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$  in the following even though the spaces and measures will generally differ.

## 2.2 Gaussian quasi-likelihood estimation

We generally make the following

**Assumption A.**  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  is a parametric polynomial state space model of order 2 and the mappings  $\theta \mapsto a_{\otimes 2}^\theta, A_{\otimes 2}^\theta, \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0)), \text{Cov}_\theta(X(0))$  are thrice continuously differentiable in  $\theta$ .

For the explicit representation of the asymptotic covariance matrix of the QML estimator in Section 3.3 we will need in fact the slightly stronger

**Assumption A'.**  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  is a parametric polynomial state space model of order 4 and the mappings  $\theta \mapsto a_{\otimes 2}^\theta, A_{\otimes 2}^\theta, \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0)), \text{Cov}_\theta(X(0))$  are thrice continuously differentiable in  $\theta$ .

We denote by  $\vartheta \in \Theta$  the unknown “true” parameter which is to be estimated based on data. The first  $m < d$  components of  $X$  are supposed to be unobservable. Put differently, the goal is to estimate  $\vartheta$  from observing  $X_o(s) := (X_{m+1}(s), \dots, X_d(s))$  in the time interval  $s = 0, 1, \dots, t$ . We generally let the subscript  $o$  stand for the observable part of a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and set  $H := (\delta_{m+i,j})_{i=1, \dots, d-m; j=1, \dots, d}$ , i.e.  $x_o := Hx = (x_{m+1}, \dots, x_d)$ , and for any matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  we write  $\Sigma_{:,o} := \Sigma H^\top = (\Sigma_{ij})_{i=1, \dots, d; j=m+1, \dots, d}$  as well as  $\Sigma_o := H \Sigma H^\top = (\Sigma_{ij})_{i=m+1, \dots, d; j=m+1, \dots, d}$ . Note that  $m = 0$  corresponds to the case where all components of  $X$  are available for estimation.

Denote by  $(Y, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  the Gaussian equivalent of our parametric polynomial state space model, see Proposition 2.6. Since  $Y$  is a Gaussian process under any  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , the induced measures

$\mathbb{P}_\theta^{(Y_0(1), \dots, Y_0(t))}$  are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure  $\lambda_{t(d-m)}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{t(d-m)}$  if the matrices  $C^\theta(t)$  are positive definite. This will be warranted by Assumption B.1 below, see Proposition 2.13. Hence it makes sense to define the densities  $q_t^\theta := d\mathbb{P}_\theta^{(Y_0(1), \dots, Y_0(t))} / d\lambda_{t(d-m)}$  as well as the conditional Gaussian densities  $q_{t|t-1}^\theta(\cdot | y_1, \dots, y_{t-1})$  of the conditional distribution of  $Y_0(t)$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  given  $Y_0(1) = y_1, \dots, Y_0(t-1) = y_{t-1}$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Then we have the decomposition

$$q_t^\theta(Y_0(1), \dots, Y_0(t)) = \prod_{s=1}^t q_{s|s-1}^\theta(Y_0(s) | Y_0(1), \dots, Y_0(s-1)),$$

where  $q_{1|0}^\theta := q_1^\theta$  is set to be the unconditional density of  $Y_0(1)$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ . It is well known that the log-likelihood  $\log q_{t|t-1}^\theta$  can be expressed in terms of the Kálmán filter.

Since we do not assume that  $E$  is of positive Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , proper maximum likelihood estimation for  $X$  may not even be well-defined because it is not assured that the analogous Lebesgue densities  $p_t^\theta$  and  $p_{t|t-1}^\theta$  for  $X$  exist at all. But even if these densities exist, statistical inference cannot be based on the generally unknown  $p_t^\theta$ . The key idea of the QML approach is therefore to replace  $p_t^\theta$  by the Gaussian density  $q_t^\theta$ , see (2.5, 2.6) below.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Consider the Kálmán filter equations for the Gaussian process  $Y$  under the measure  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , but applied to the process  $X$  given the observations  $X_0$ . These read as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X}^\theta(0, -1) &:= \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0)), \\ \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(0, -1) &:= \text{Cov}_\theta(X(0)), \\ \widehat{X}^\theta(t+1, t) &:= a^\theta + A^\theta \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t), \\ \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t) &:= \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t-1) + \widehat{\Sigma}_{:,0}^\theta(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_0^\theta(t, t-1)^+ (X_0(t) - \widehat{X}_0^\theta(t, t-1)), \\ \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t+1, t) &:= A^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t) (A^\theta)^\top + C^\theta(t+1), \\ \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t) &:= \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1) - \widehat{\Sigma}_{:,0}^\theta(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_0^\theta(t, t-1)^+ \widehat{\Sigma}_{:,0}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , where the superscript  $+$  stands for the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of a matrix. Then, setting  $\varepsilon^\theta(t) := X_0(t) - \widehat{X}_0^\theta(t, t-1)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , the Gaussian quasi log-likelihood is of the form

$$L^\theta(t) := \log q_t^\theta(X_0^\theta(1), \dots, X_0^\theta(t)) = \sum_{s=1}^t L^\theta(s, s-1) := \sum_{s=1}^t \log q_{s|s-1}^\theta(X_0(s) | X_0(1), \dots, X_0(s-1)) \quad (2.5)$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  with

$$L^\theta(t, t-1) = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \log |\det \widehat{\Sigma}_0^\theta(t, t-1)| + \varepsilon^\theta(t)^\top \widehat{\Sigma}_0^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} \varepsilon^\theta(t) \right]. \quad (2.6)$$

We naturally refer to a maximiser  $\widehat{\theta}(t)$  of (2.5) as a QML estimator, see Definition 3.1 below. Instead of considering maximisers of  $L^\theta(t)$ , one could alternatively define an estimator to be a solution to the score equation  $Z^\theta(t) = 0$ , where  $Z^\theta(t) := \nabla_\theta L^\theta(t)$  denotes the quasi-score function corresponding to our quasi-likelihood. This approach is for example pursued in Jacod and Sørensen [70] in the context of general estimating functions. As is explained in Heyde [64] or Sørensen [104], desirable asymptotic properties of the QML estimator often hold if the estimating function is unbiased in the sense that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(Z^\theta(t)) = 0$ . More specifically, we may hope for consistency and asymptotic normality with asymptotic covariance of the form

$V_{\vartheta} = W(\vartheta)^{-1}U_{\vartheta}W(\vartheta)^{-1}$ , where  $W(\vartheta) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \nabla_{\vartheta}^2 L^{\vartheta}(t, t-1)$  is a kind of Fisher information matrix for the quasi-likelihood under consideration and  $U_{\vartheta} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \text{Cov}_{\vartheta}(Z^{\vartheta}(t))$  denotes the asymptotic covariance matrix of the estimating function.

Unbiasedness of the score function typically holds for the true likelihood rather than the quasi-likelihood. But since our Gaussian quasi-score is a quadratic function of the observations and since the first two moments of our model coincide with those of its Gaussian equivalent, we naturally obtain that unbiasedness of the estimating function holds in our quasi-likelihood setup as well.

A number of challenges have to be met. Firstly, we must establish sufficient ergodic properties for the above programme to work in our setup. Secondly, we need to express  $W(\vartheta), U_{\vartheta}$  in a way that is computable in practice. Two different approaches are provided in Sections 3.2 and 3.3 below. The first one is based on observations – from either data or Monte-Carlo simulations – of  $\nabla_{\theta} Z^{\theta}(t)|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}(t)}$  as well as of  $Z^{\theta}(t)|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}(t)}$ . The alternative solution from Section 3.3 relies on expressing  $W(\vartheta), U_{\vartheta}$  in closed-form as a function of  $\vartheta$  and using the fact that  $\hat{\theta}(t) \rightarrow \vartheta$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}$ -probability. Due to the complexity of this explicit representation, the implementation of this approach is slightly more involved. But it is rewarded by a much higher computational efficiency because no simulation is needed.

In order to establish the outlined asymptotic properties of the QML estimating sequence, we naturally have to impose a couple of additional assumptions, summarised below.

**Assumption B.** 1. For any  $\theta \in \Theta$ , the transition measures  $P_{\theta}(x, \cdot)$  of  $X$  are equivalent to  $\lambda_E$  for any  $x \in E$  and  $X$  is weakly Feller, i.e.  $P_{\theta}(x, \cdot) \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow x_0} P_{\theta}(x_0, \cdot)$  weakly for all  $x_0 \in E$ .

2. There is some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $X$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}(\mathbb{P}_{\theta})$  for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

**Remark 2.9.** Assumption B.1 implies that the conditional distributions of  $X(t)$  given  $X(t-1)$  under any  $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}$  are equivalent to the Hausdorff measure  $\lambda_E$  on  $E$ . By the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation this yields that also the unconditional laws of  $X(t)$  are equivalent to  $\lambda_E$ .

We note that the conditions in Assumption B can be slightly weakened if  $X$  is obtained by sampling from an affine stochastic process with existing finite sixth moments. In this case, the Riccati differential equations for the characteristic function of  $X$  can be used to yield particularly simple expressions for the matrices  $A_{\otimes^r}^{\theta}$  for orders  $r \in \{2, \dots, 6\}$ , see Remark 2.3:

**Proposition 2.10.** Suppose that  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is obtained by sampling from an affine process  $(X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  and fix an even  $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . If  $X(t) \in L^p(\mathbb{P}_{\theta})$  and  $\rho(A^{\theta}) < 1$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ , then  $X$  is bounded in  $L^p(\mathbb{P}_{\theta})$ . Hence, if  $p \geq 6$  and  $\rho(A^{\theta}) < 1$ , condition 2 of Assumption B is fulfilled.

We can now prove an ergodic theorem for the process  $X$  which moreover gives a statement about the speed of convergence for expectations of quadratic resp. quartic polynomials in  $X$  and which justifies the condition  $\rho(A^{\theta}) < 1$  from Proposition 2.10. The following proposition uses the terminology of strong  $f$ -ergodicity of Markov chains in the following sense:

**Definition 2.11.** Let  $X$  be an  $E$ -valued discrete-time process on some space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and  $\mu$  a probability measure on  $\mathcal{B}(E)$ . Moreover, let  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be  $\mu$ -integrable. We call  $X$  **strongly  $f$ -ergodic** (with respect to  $\mu$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ ) if the following conditions hold:

1.  $\mathbb{P}^{X(t)} \rightarrow \mu$  weakly as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

$$2. \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(X(s)) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \int f \, d\mu \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-almost surely.}$$

If convergence in 2. holds only in probability, then  $X$  is called **weakly  $f$ -ergodic** with respect to  $\mu$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ . Whenever there is no ambiguity concerning the measures  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mu$  under consideration, we just call  $X$  strongly (resp. weakly)  $f$ -ergodic in the above definition.

**Proposition 2.12.** *Suppose that Assumptions A (resp. A') and B hold and let  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Then there exists a unique stationary law  $\mu_\theta$  for  $X$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  and  $X$  is strongly  $f$ -ergodic for any  $\mu_\theta$ -integrable function  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover,  $\mu_\theta$  has finite moments of order  $4 + \delta$  and  $\rho(A_{\otimes r}^\theta) < 1$  for  $r = 1, 2$  (resp.  $r = 1, \dots, 4$ ). Finally,  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(g(X(t))) \rightarrow \int g \, d\mu_\theta$  at a geometric rate for any quadratic (resp. quartic) polynomial  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .*

The following proposition is a simple consequence of Proposition 2.12.

**Proposition 2.13.** *Suppose that Assumptions A and B hold. Then  $C^\theta(t)$  is positive definite and thrice continuously differentiable in  $\theta$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Moreover, for any multi-index  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_3^k$  the matrices  $\partial_\theta^\alpha C^\theta(t)$  converge at a geometric rate uniformly in  $\theta \in \Theta$  to some limits and  $C^\theta := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} C^\theta(t)$  is positive definite.*

Let  $\alpha^\theta = (I_d - A^\theta)^{-1}a^\theta$  denote the solution to the fixed point equation  $\alpha^\theta = a^\theta + A^\theta \alpha^\theta$  and  $\Lambda^\theta$  the solution to the Lyapunov equation  $\Lambda^\theta = A^\theta \Lambda^\theta A^{\theta^\top} + C^\theta$ . Since  $\rho(A^\theta) < 1$  by Proposition 2.12 and since  $C^\theta$  is positive definite by Proposition 2.13, these solutions exist uniquely and  $\Lambda^\theta$  is positive definite by Lemma A.10.2. Moreover, Lemma A.10 also yields that  $\alpha^\theta$  and  $\Lambda^\theta$  are the stationary mean and covariance matrix of  $X$  under its invariant probability measure  $\mu_\theta$  from Proposition 2.12. As a further condition for the main results, we need some form of identifiability for the parameter  $\theta \in \Theta$ , i.e. a sufficient distinguishability of different parameters  $\theta \neq \theta'$ . To this end we consider the Markov process

$$Y^{\text{stat}}(t) = a^\theta + A^\theta Y^{\text{stat}}(t-1) + B^\theta W^\theta(t) \quad (2.7)$$

with independent standard normal  $W^\theta(t), t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  and initial law  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{Y^{\text{stat}}(0)} = \mathcal{N}(\alpha^\theta, \Lambda^\theta)$ . This process differs from the Gaussian equivalent (2.4) in Proposition 2.6 only by the moments at time 0 and in the sense that the time-dependent covariance matrices  $B^\theta(t)B^\theta(t)^\top = C^\theta(t)$  are replaced by the limiting covariance matrix  $C^\theta =: B^\theta B^{\theta^\top}$ . It is easy to see that  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  is in fact stationary, i.e. the unique invariant probability measure for the Gaussian process  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  is given by  $\mathcal{N}(\alpha^\theta, \Lambda^\theta)$ . Let  $\hat{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(t, t-1)$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(t, t-1)$  denote the Kálmán filter with corresponding covariance matrices for  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  instead of  $Y$ , see Proposition 2.8. In particular,  $\hat{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(0, -1) = \alpha^\theta$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(0, -1) = \Lambda^\theta$ . We will show in Section 5.2.3 that the following assumption suffices for identifiability of the parameter  $\theta$  in a suitable sense:

**Assumption C.** *For every  $\theta \neq \theta'$  with  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ , there exists some integer  $u \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\hat{\Sigma}_0^{\theta, \text{stat}}(u, u-1) \neq \hat{\Sigma}_0^{\theta', \text{stat}}(u, u-1)$  or  $\hat{Y}_0^{\theta, \text{stat}}(u, u-1)$  differs from  $\hat{Y}_0^{\theta', \text{stat}}(u, u-1)$  as a deterministic function of the observations  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u-1)$ .*

**Remark 2.14.** The above assumption may be somewhat laborious to verify in concrete applications. Most of the time when Assumption C is fulfilled, it is however actually the case that it is fulfilled already with  $u = 0$ , i.e. the parameter  $\theta$  is identifiable from the observed part of the stationary mean and covariance matrix. We could therefore replace Assumption C by the following stronger assumption, which is easier to verify in practice:

**Assumption C'.** *For every  $\theta \neq \theta'$  with  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$  one has  $\alpha_0^\theta \neq \alpha_0^{\theta'}$  or  $\Lambda_0^\theta \neq \Lambda_0^{\theta'}$ .*

### 3 Main results

#### 3.1 Consistency and asymptotic normality

We now turn to the quasi-maximum likelihood (QML) estimation of the unknown parameter  $\vartheta$  by focusing on a sequence of maximisers  $\hat{\theta}(t)$  of  $L^\theta(t)$  from (2.5). As in Section 2.2 we fix a parametric state space model  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  with “true” parameter  $\vartheta \in \Theta$ . Moreover, we assume that Assumptions A, B, and C hold. Since the parameter space  $\Theta$  is assumed to be compact and since the quasi-likelihood  $L^\theta(t)$  is a continuous function of  $\theta$  by Assumption A, the existence of such maximisers is always guaranteed in our setting.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . A **quasi-maximum likelihood estimator** for the polynomial state space model  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  is any  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random variable  $\hat{\theta}(t)$  with values in the parameter space  $\Theta$  such that  $\hat{\theta}(t) \in \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} L^\theta(t)$ , where  $L^\theta(t)$  is defined in (2.5).*

As usual in the statistical literature, we call a sequence  $(\hat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  **(weakly)  $\vartheta$ -consistent** if  $\hat{\theta}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} \vartheta$ . Recall that  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t)$  denotes the  $(k \times k)$ -matrix whose  $ij$ -th entry is  $\partial_{\theta_i} Z^\theta(t)_j$ .

**Remark 3.2.** It can be shown that  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurability in Definition 3.1 of a QML estimator is not a restrictive assumption: In particular, since  $\Theta$  is compact and  $L^\theta(t)$  is continuous in  $\theta$ , Jennrich [71, Lemma 2] shows existence of an  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ -adapted sequence  $(\hat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  of QML estimators as in Definition 3.1.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Any sequence of QML estimators  $(\hat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is  $\vartheta$ -consistent.*

The proof of this and the following theorems is to be found in Section 5.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose that  $\vartheta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$ . Then we have:*

1. *The limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) \Big|_{\theta = \hat{\theta}(t)} = W(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  exists in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability.*
2. *There exists a positive semidefinite matrix  $U_\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  such that  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} Z^\vartheta(t)$  converges in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -law to some Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and covariance matrix  $U_\vartheta$ .*
3. *If the matrix  $W(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  is invertible, there exists some  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued Gaussian random variable  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, V_\vartheta)$  with  $V_\vartheta := W(\vartheta)^{-1} U_\vartheta W(\vartheta)^{-1}$  such that we have*

$$\sqrt{t}(\hat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta\text{-d}} Z.$$

In order to be applicable in practice, we need more explicit estimates or representations of  $V_\vartheta$ . As noted in Section 2.2, two conceptually different ones are provided in the following Sections 3.2 and 3.3. The former approach only requires Assumption A, while the latter relies on the stronger Assumption A’.

#### 3.2 Estimation of the asymptotic covariance matrix

The approach in this section is based on the quasi-score process  $Z^\theta(t) = \nabla_\theta L^\theta(t)$  and its derivative  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t)$ . If we further define the conditional score process  $Z^\theta(t, t-1) := \nabla_\theta L^\theta(t, t-1)$ , one has  $Z^\theta(t) = \sum_{s=1}^t Z^\theta(s, s-1)$ . Differentiating the Gaussian quasi-log-likelihood (2.6) now yields the following expression.

**Proposition 3.5.** For  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , the  $j$ -th component of  $Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  is given by

$$Z^\theta(t, t-1)_j = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \kappa_j^\theta(t) - 2V_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} \varepsilon^\theta(t) - \varepsilon^\theta(t)^\top \widetilde{S}_{\circ,j}^\theta(t) \varepsilon^\theta(t) \right] \quad (3.1)$$

with  $\kappa_j^\theta(t) := \text{Tr}(\widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} S_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1))$ , initial values  $V_j^\theta(0, -1) := \partial_{\theta_j} \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0))$  as well as  $S_j^\theta(0, -1) := \partial_{\theta_j} \text{Cov}_\theta(X(0))$ , where the vectors  $V_j^\theta(t, t-1)$  and matrices  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_j^\theta(t, t) &:= V_j^\theta(t, t-1) + (S_j^\theta)_{:, \circ}(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} \varepsilon^\theta(t) - \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,j}^\theta(t) \varepsilon^\theta(t) - \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) V_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1), \\ V_j^\theta(t+1, t) &:= \partial_{\theta_j} a^\theta + (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t) + A^\theta V_j^\theta(t, t), \\ S_j^\theta(t, t) &:= S_j^\theta(t, t-1) - (S_j^\theta)_{:, \circ}(t, t-1) \widetilde{K}^\theta(t)^\top - \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) (S_j^\theta)_{:, \circ}(t, t-1)^\top + \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,j}^\theta(t) \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top, \\ S_j^\theta(t+1, t) &:= A^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t) (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)^\top + (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t) A^{\theta\top} + A^\theta S_j^\theta(t-1, t-1) A^{\theta\top} + \partial_{\theta_j} C^\theta(t), \\ \widetilde{S}_{\circ,j}^\theta(t) &:= \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} S_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1}, \\ \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) &:= \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular,  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1) = \partial_{\theta_j} \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and  $S_j^\theta(t, t) = \partial_{\theta_j} \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, we have  $V_j^\theta(t, t-1) = \partial_{\theta_j} \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and  $V_j^\theta(t, t) = \partial_{\theta_j} \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Differentiating the Gaussian quasi-log-likelihood once more, we obtain the following representation for the  $\mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ -valued process  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) = \sum_{s=1}^t \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(s, s-1)$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** For  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , the  $ij$ -th component of  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  is given by

$$\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t, t-1)_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \mu_{ij}^\theta(t) + 2V_{ij}^\theta(t) \varepsilon^\theta(t) + \varepsilon^\theta(t)^\top \psi_{ij}^\theta(t) \varepsilon^\theta(t) + 2V_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} V_{\circ,i}^\theta(t, t-1) \right] \quad (3.2)$$

with the abbreviations  $\mu_{ij}^\theta(t) := \text{Tr}[\widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} R_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t, t-1) - \widetilde{S}_{\circ,i}^\theta(t) S_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1)]$  as well as  $v_{ij}^\theta(t) := V_{\circ,i}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top \widetilde{S}_{\circ,j}^\theta(t) + V_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top \widetilde{S}_{\circ,i}^\theta(t) - W_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1}$  and  $\psi_{ij}^\theta(t) := \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} \widetilde{S}_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t) - \widetilde{R}_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$ . Here, initial values are given as  $W_{ij}^\theta(0, -1) := \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0))$  and  $R_{ij}^\theta(0, -1) := \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} \text{Cov}_\theta(X(0))$ , and we set

$$\begin{aligned} W_{ij}^\theta(t+1, t) &:= \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} a^\theta + (\partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t) + (\partial_{\theta_i} A^\theta) V_{\circ,i}^\theta(t, t) + (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) V_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t) + A^\theta W_{ij}^\theta(t, t), \\ W_{ij}^\theta(t, t) &:= W_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1) + M_{ij}^\theta(t) \varepsilon^\theta(t) + N_j^\theta(t) V_{\circ,i}^\theta(t, t-1) + N_i^\theta(t) V_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1) - \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) W_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t, t-1), \\ R_{ij}^\theta(t+1, t) &:= \text{Sym}[\widetilde{R}_{ij}^\theta(t, t)] + A^\theta R_{ij}^\theta(t, t) A^{\theta\top} + \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} C^\theta(t), \\ R_{ij}^\theta(t, t) &:= R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1) + \text{Sym}[\widetilde{R}_{ij}^\theta(t, t)] + \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1) \widetilde{R}_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top - \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t) \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top, \\ \widetilde{R}_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t+1, t) &:= \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t+1, t)^{-1} R_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t+1, t) \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t+1, t)^{-1}, \\ \widetilde{R}_{ij}^\theta(t, t) &:= (\partial_{\theta_i} A^\theta) \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t) (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)^\top + A^\theta S_{\circ,i}^\theta(t, t) (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)^\top + A^\theta S_j^\theta(t, t) (\partial_{\theta_i} A^\theta)^\top + A^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t) (\partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)^\top, \\ \widetilde{R}_{ij}^\theta(t, t) &:= (\widetilde{S}_{:, \circ}^\theta)_{ij}(t) \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1)^\top - \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) (R_{:, \circ}^\theta)_{ij}(t, t-1)^\top - (S_{:, \circ}^\theta)_j(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} (S_{:, \circ}^\theta)_i(t, t-1)^\top, \\ M_{ij}^\theta(t) &:= (R_{:, \circ}^\theta)_{ij}(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1} - (\widetilde{S}_{:, \circ}^\theta)_{ij}(t) + \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t) - \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) R_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1}, \\ N_j^\theta(t) &:= \widehat{\Sigma}_{:, \circ}^\theta(t, t-1) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,j}^\theta(t) - (S_{:, \circ}^\theta)_j(t, t-1) \widehat{\Sigma}_\circ^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1}, \\ (\widetilde{S}_{:, \circ}^\theta)_{ij}(t) &:= (S_{:, \circ}^\theta)_j(t, t-1) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,i}^\theta(t) + (S_{:, \circ}^\theta)_i(t, t-1) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,j}^\theta(t), \\ \widetilde{S}_{\circ,ij}^\theta(t) &:= S_{\circ,j}^\theta(t, t-1) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,i}^\theta(t) + S_{\circ,i}^\theta(t, t-1) \widetilde{S}_{\circ,j}^\theta(t) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , where we adopt the notation and abbreviations from Proposition 3.5. In particular,  $R_{ij}^\theta(t+1, t) = \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t+1, t)$  and  $R_{ij}^\theta(t, t) = \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, we have  $W_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1) = \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and  $W_{ij}^\theta(t, t) = \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Note that the coefficients in the preceding propositions stabilise in the following sense:

**Lemma 3.7.** *There exists a positive definite matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta$  as well as symmetric matrices  $S_j^\theta, R_{ij}^\theta$  for  $\theta \in \Theta$  and  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that, uniformly in  $\theta \in \Theta$ , we have  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1) \rightarrow \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta, S_j^\theta(t, t-1) \rightarrow S_j^\theta$ , and  $R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1) \rightarrow R_{ij}^\theta$  at a geometric rate as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .*

Since  $W(\vartheta) = \mathbb{P}_\vartheta\text{-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) \Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}(t)}$ , we can use  $\widehat{W}_i[\widehat{\theta}(t)] := \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) \Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}(t)}$  as a consistent estimator, where  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t)$  is obtained using the recursion in Proposition 3.6. The situation is less obvious for  $U_\vartheta$ . Since the increments  $Z^\theta(s, s-1), s = 1, \dots, t$  of  $Z^\theta(t)$  are dependent, it may not be immediately obvious how to express its limiting covariance matrix in terms of a law of large numbers. Due to the Markovian structure of the process  $(X(t), \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t-1), V^\theta(t, t-1))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ , however, such a representation can be established by an approach going back to Gordin and Lifšic [60].

To do so we first need the following matrix product introduced by Tracy and Singh [107], which basically behaves like a block-wise Kronecker product for partitioned matrices:

**Definition 3.8.** *Let the matrix  $A = (A_{ij})_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  be partitioned into submatrices  $A_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{m' \times n'}$ , and let the matrix  $B = (B_{kl})_{kl} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$  be partitioned into submatrices  $B_{kl} \in \mathbb{R}^{p' \times q'}$ . Then we define the **Tracy–Singh product**  $A \circ_{\substack{m' \times n' \\ p' \times q'}} B := ((A_{ij} \otimes B_{kl})_{ij})_{kl} \in \mathbb{R}^{m p \times n q}$  of  $A$  and  $B$ , i.e. the  $kl$ -th subblock of the  $ij$ -th subblock of  $A \circ_{\substack{m' \times n' \\ p' \times q'}} B$  is given by  $A_{ij} \otimes B_{kl}$ .*

It is clear from the above definition that the Tracy–Singh product of two partitioned matrices depends crucially on the chosen partition of the matrices into submatrices. If, for example,

$$A = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ \hline A_{21} & A_{22} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad B = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ \hline B_{21} & B_{22} \end{array} \right)$$

are partitioned into  $(m \times n)$ -subblocks  $(A_{ij})_{i,j \in \{1,2\}}$  and  $(p \times q)$ -subblocks  $(B_{kl})_{k,l \in \{1,2\}}$ , then

$$A \circ_{\substack{m \times n \\ p \times q}} B = \left( \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} A_{11} \otimes B_{11} & A_{11} \otimes B_{12} & A_{12} \otimes B_{11} & A_{12} \otimes B_{12} \\ \hline A_{11} \otimes B_{21} & A_{11} \otimes B_{22} & A_{12} \otimes B_{21} & A_{12} \otimes B_{22} \\ \hline A_{21} \otimes B_{11} & A_{21} \otimes B_{12} & A_{22} \otimes B_{11} & A_{22} \otimes B_{12} \\ \hline A_{21} \otimes B_{21} & A_{21} \otimes B_{22} & A_{22} \otimes B_{21} & A_{22} \otimes B_{22} \end{array} \right).$$

For a given  $k$ -dimensional polynomial  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  of order  $r$ , we say that  $\alpha_f \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times \frac{d}{r-1} (d^{r-1})}$  and  $\beta_f \in \mathbb{R}^k$  denote a pair of coefficients of  $f$  if  $f(x) = \alpha_f \text{vec}_{\otimes r}(x) + \beta_f$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Of course, since the stacked Kronecker product  $\text{vec}_{\otimes r}(x)$  contains some powers of  $x$  multiple times, the choice of coefficients  $\alpha_f$  and  $\beta_f$  for a given  $f$  is not unique, which will however not pose a problem in the sequel. Since  $X$  is a polynomial state space model of order 2 with corresponding martingale difference sequence  $N^\theta$ , there exist some matrices  $Q_{\otimes 2}^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d^2}$  and  $Q^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2 \times d}$  as well as some  $q^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta [N^\theta(t) \otimes N^\theta(t) \mid X(t-1) = x] = Q_{\otimes 2}^\theta(x \otimes x) + Q^\theta x + q^\theta$$

for any  $x \in E$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Note that by Proposition 2.10 and in particular by equation (5.2) in the corresponding proof,  $Q_{\otimes 2}^\theta = 0$  if  $X$  is obtained by discrete sampling from an affine process.

For the following statement we introduce some more notation. Set  $\widehat{X}^\theta(t) := \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t-1)$ ,  $V^\theta(t) := V^\theta(t, t-1)$ ,  $W^\theta(t) := W^\theta(t, t-1)$ ,  $\bar{X}^\theta(t) := (X(t), \widehat{X}^\theta(t), V^\theta(t))$  as well as

$$K^\theta := A^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}_{:,o}^\theta (\widehat{\Sigma}_o^\theta)^{-1}, \quad F^\theta := A^\theta - K^\theta H,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{Q}_{\otimes 2}^{\theta} &:= \left( e_1^{(k+2)} e_1^{(k+2)\top} \right) \circ_{d \times d}^{(k+2) \times (k+2)} \left[ \left( e_1^{(k+2)} e_1^{(k+2)\top} \right) \otimes Q_{\otimes 2}^{\theta} \right], \\
\bar{Q}^{\theta} &:= \left( e_1^{(k+2)} e_1^{(k+2)\top} \right) \circ_{d \times d}^{(k+2) \times (k+2)} \left[ e_1^{(k+2)} \otimes Q^{\theta} \right], \\
\bar{q}^{\theta} &:= e_1^{(k+2)} \circ_{d \times 1}^{(k+2) \times 1} \left[ e_1^{(k+2)} \otimes q^{\theta} \right], \\
\bar{a}^{\theta} &:= \begin{pmatrix} a^{\theta} \\ a^{\theta} \\ \nabla_{\theta} a^{\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{A}^{\theta} := \begin{pmatrix} A^{\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ K^{\theta} H & F^{\theta} & 0 \\ \nabla_{\theta} K^{\theta} H & \nabla_{\theta} F^{\theta} & \text{diag}_k(F^{\theta}) \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Pi_{\theta} &:= \bar{a}^{\theta} \otimes \bar{A}^{\theta} + \bar{A}^{\theta} \otimes \bar{a}^{\theta} + \bar{Q}^{\theta}, \quad O_{\theta} := \bar{A}^{\theta} \otimes \bar{A}^{\theta} + \bar{Q}_{\otimes 2}^{\theta}, \\
\bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^{\theta} &:= \begin{pmatrix} \bar{a}^{\theta} \\ \bar{a}^{\theta} \otimes \bar{a}^{\theta} + \bar{q}^{\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^{\theta} := \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}^{\theta} & 0 \\ \Pi_{\theta} & O_{\theta} \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

**Proposition 3.9.** Define the matrices

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_1^{\theta} &:= H^{\top} (\widehat{\Sigma}_o^{\theta})^{-1} H, \quad \Gamma_{2,j}^{\theta} := H^{\top} (\widehat{\Sigma}_o^{\theta})^{-1} S_{j,o}^{\theta} (\widehat{\Sigma}_o^{\theta})^{-1} H, \\
\Gamma_{\theta}^{(j)} &:= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{2,j}^{\theta} & -\Gamma_{2,j}^{\theta} & (e_j^{(k)} \otimes \Gamma_1^{\theta})^{\top} \\ -\Gamma_{2,j}^{\theta} & \Gamma_{2,j}^{\theta} & -(e_j^{(k)} \otimes \Gamma_1^{\theta})^{\top} \\ e_j^{(k)} \otimes \Gamma_1^{\theta} & -e_j^{(k)} \otimes \Gamma_1^{\theta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+2)d \times (k+2)d}
\end{aligned}$$

for  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , as well as the matrix  $\Gamma^{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (k+2)^2 d^2}$  such that its  $j$ -th row is given by  $\text{vec}(\Gamma_{\theta}^{(j)})$ . Then the matrix  $U_{\vartheta}$  from Theorem 3.4 is the limit in  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta}$ -probability of  $\widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  with

$$\widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)] := \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \left[ g^{\theta}(\bar{X}^{\theta}(s)) g^{\theta}(\bar{X}^{\theta}(s))^{\top} - h^{\theta}(\bar{X}^{\theta}(s)) h^{\theta}(\bar{X}^{\theta}(s))^{\top} \right] \Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}(t)}, \tag{3.5}$$

where  $g^{\theta} : \mathbb{R}^{(k+2)d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $h^{\theta} : \mathbb{R}^{(k+2)d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  are  $k$ -dimensional polynomials with coefficients  $\alpha_g^{\theta} = (-\Gamma_{\theta}(O_{\theta} - I)^{-1} \Pi_{\theta} (\bar{A}_1^{\theta} - I)^{-1} \mid \Gamma^{\theta}(O_{\theta} - I)^{-1})$ ,  $\beta_g^{\theta} = 0$ ,  $\alpha_h^{\theta} = \alpha_g^{\theta} \bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^{\theta}$  as well as  $\beta_h^{\theta} = \alpha_g^{\theta} \bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^{\theta}$ .

Since the asymptotic covariance matrix in Theorem 3.4 equals  $V_{\vartheta} = W(\vartheta)^{-1} U_{\vartheta} W(\vartheta)^{-1}$ , it can be consistently estimated by  $\widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)] := \widehat{W}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]^{-1} \widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)] \widehat{W}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\widehat{W}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)] \text{ invertible}\}}$  with  $\widehat{W}_t[\theta] := \frac{1}{t} \nabla_{\theta} Z^{\theta}(t)$  and where  $\widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  is given in (3.5). If moreover  $U_{\vartheta}$  is invertible, then  $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)] \text{ invertible}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and we obtain

$$\sqrt{t} \widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]^{-1/2} (\widehat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta) \mathbb{1}_{\{\widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)] \text{ invertible}\}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta-d}} Y$$

with  $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_k)$ .

**Remark 3.10.** The estimator (3.5) still cannot be used to estimate  $U_{\vartheta}$  in practice because it depends on the unobservable part of the data  $X$ . This can be remedied for example by replacing the unobservable components in  $X(s)$  in (3.5) by those of the filter  $\widehat{X}^{\theta}(s, s) \Big|_{\theta=\widehat{\theta}(t)}$ . Figure 1 shows that – at least in the example of the Heston model from Section 4.1 – the relative error made by this additional approximation seems rather negligible and stays below one percent for the estimation of asymptotic standard deviations of the QML estimator components.

As an alternative, one could use Monte-Carlo samples of  $X(s)$ ,  $s = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  rather than real data. This even allows to use an arbitrarily large sample size which exceeds the one of the given data set. But since the simulation will be based on the estimated parameter  $\widehat{\theta}(t)$  rather than the unknown  $\vartheta$ , a sufficiently large sample of data is needed in either case.






Figure 1: Two sequences of standard deviation estimates for the four parameters  $\kappa$ ,  $m$ ,  $\sigma$ ,  $\rho$  of the Heston model (4.1, 4.2) with unobservable stochastic variance are obtained from the sequence of matrices  $\widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$ . For the first sequence of standard deviation estimates, the estimator  $\widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  from (3.5) is computed using the knowledge of the unobservable variance component, while for the second sequence of estimates, the unobservable variance is replaced by its Kálmán filter during computation of  $\widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$ . The figure displays the relative error in percent between these two standard deviation estimates for all four parameters.

The easy computability of  $\widehat{U}_t$  stems from the polynomial Markov structure which is not present in the estimation of VARMA models with arbitrary uncorrelated noise sequences as in Boubacar Maïnassara and Francq [26] or Schlemm and Stelzer [100]. The former suggest estimating  $U_\vartheta = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cov}_\vartheta \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \sum_{s=1}^t Z^\vartheta(s, s-1) \right]$  by approximating

$$\text{Cov}_\vartheta \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \sum_{s=1}^t Z^\vartheta(s, s-1) \right] = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{u=1}^t \text{Cov}_\vartheta [Z^\vartheta(s, s-1), Z^\vartheta(u, u-1)]$$

using a non-parametric kernel estimator, also called heteroskedastic autocorrelation consistent (HAC) estimator or Newey–West estimator, see Andrews [8] or Newey and West [87]. Alternatively, extending a result of Francq et al. [58], Boubacar Maïnassara and Francq [26] prove consistency of an estimator of  $U_\vartheta$  that builds on a parametric estimate of the spectral density of  $Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)$  under the additional assumption of finite  $(8 + \delta)$ th moments of  $X(t)$ . None of these more advanced techniques are needed in the computation of our covariance estimator  $\widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  from (3.5), which only requires the evaluation of simple matrix manipulations, coming from the fact that the polynomial model assumptions permit the use of the Markov chain central limit result A.18 in the proof of Theorem 5.11.

### 3.3 Explicit computation of the asymptotic covariance matrix

In contrast to Section 3.2, we now provide explicit representations of  $U_\vartheta, W(\vartheta)$  and hence  $V_\vartheta$  in Theorem 3.4. To this end, we reconsider some of the processes from the previous section in state-space form. For brevity, set  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\vartheta(t) := \widehat{\Sigma}^\vartheta(t, t-1)$  and  $S_j^\vartheta(t) := S_j^\vartheta(t, t-1)$  as well as

$K^\theta(t) := A^\theta \widetilde{K}^\theta(t)$ ,  $F^\theta(t) := A^\theta - K^\theta(t)H$  and  $(\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_j(t) := (S_j^\theta)_{:,o}(t) \widehat{\Sigma}_o^\theta(t)^{-1} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{:,o}^\theta(t) \widetilde{S}_{o,j}^\theta(t)$ . Observe that  $\widehat{X}^\theta(0) = \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0))$ ,  $V^\theta(0) = \nabla_\theta \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0))$ ,  $W^\theta(0) = \nabla_\theta^2 \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0))$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} X(t+1) &= a^\vartheta + A^\vartheta X(t) + N^\vartheta(t+1), \\ \widehat{X}^\theta(t+1) &= a^{\theta,0} + A^{\theta,0}(t)X(t) + A^{\theta,0,0}(t)\widehat{X}^\theta(t), \\ V_j^\theta(t+1) &= a_j^{\theta,1} + A_j^{\theta,1}(t)X(t) + A_j^{\theta,1,0}(t)\widehat{X}^\theta(t) + A^{\theta,1,1}(t)V_j^\theta(t), \\ W_{ij}^\theta(t+1) &= a_{ij}^{\theta,2} + A_{ij}^{\theta,2}(t)X(t) + A_{ij}^{\theta,2,0}(t)\widehat{X}^\theta(t) + A_i^{\theta,2,1}(t)V_j^\theta(t) + A_j^{\theta,2,1}(t)V_i^\theta(t) + A^{\theta,2,2}(t)W_{ij}^\theta(t) \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , where we define the shorthands  $a^{\theta,0} := a^\theta$ ,  $a_j^{\theta,1} := \partial_{\theta_j} a^\theta$ ,  $a_{ij}^{\theta,2} := \partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} a^\theta$  as well as

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\theta,0}(t) &:= K^\theta(t)H, \\ A_j^{\theta,1}(t) &:= [(\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) + (\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_j(t)]H, \\ A_{ij}^{\theta,2}(t) &:= [(\partial_{\theta_j} \partial_{\theta_i} A^\theta) \widetilde{K}^\theta(t) + (\partial_{\theta_i} A^\theta)(\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_j(t) + (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)(\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_i(t) + A^\theta M_{ij}^\theta(t)]H, \\ A^{\theta,0,0}(t) &:= A^{\theta,1,1}(t) := A^{\theta,2,2}(t) := F^\theta(t), \\ A_j^{\theta,1,0}(t) &:= (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) - A_j^{\theta,1}(t), \\ A_{ij}^{\theta,2,0}(t) &:= (\partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) - A_{ij}^{\theta,2}(t), \\ A_j^{\theta,2,1}(t) &:= (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)(I - \widetilde{K}^\theta(t)H) + A^\theta N_j^\theta(t)H. \end{aligned}$$

We let  $\widetilde{K}^\theta$ ,  $K^\theta$ ,  $F^\theta$ ,  $\kappa_j^\theta$ ,  $\mu_{ij}^\theta$ ,  $\nu_{ij}^\theta$ ,  $\psi_{ij}^\theta$ ,  $\widetilde{S}_{o,j}^\theta$ ,  $(\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_j$ ,  $M_{ij}^\theta$  and  $N_j^\theta$  denote the limits of  $\widetilde{K}^\theta(t)$ ,  $K^\theta(t)$ ,  $F^\theta(t)$ ,  $\kappa_j^\theta(t)$ ,  $\mu_{ij}^\theta(t)$ ,  $\nu_{ij}^\theta(t)$ ,  $\psi_{ij}^\theta(t)$ ,  $\widetilde{S}_{o,j}^\theta(t)$ ,  $(\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_j(t)$ ,  $M_{ij}^\theta(t)$  and  $N_j^\theta(t)$ , which exist by Lemma 3.7. Then we can define time-homogeneous counterparts  $\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ ,  $V^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ ,  $W^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  of  $\widehat{X}^\theta$ ,  $V^\theta$ ,  $W^\theta$  with the same initial values. These are obtained from Propositions 2.8, 3.5 and 3.6 if we use the above limits instead of their time-dependent counterparts and  $C^\theta$  instead of  $C^\theta(t)$ , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t+1) &:= a^{\theta,0} + A^{\theta,0}X(t) + A^{\theta,0,0}\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t), \\ V_j^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t+1) &:= a_j^{\theta,1} + A_j^{\theta,1}X(t) + A_j^{\theta,1,0}\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) + A^{\theta,1,1}V_j^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t), \\ W_{ij}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t+1) &:= a_{ij}^{\theta,2} + A_{ij}^{\theta,2}X(t) + A_{ij}^{\theta,2,0}\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) + A_i^{\theta,2,1}V_j^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) + A_j^{\theta,2,1}V_i^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) + A^{\theta,2,2}W_{ij}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , where we analogously define the shorthands

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\theta,0} &:= K^\theta H, \\ A_j^{\theta,1} &:= [(\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) \widetilde{K}^\theta + (\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_j]H, \\ A_{ij}^{\theta,2} &:= [(\partial_{\theta_j} \partial_{\theta_i} A^\theta) \widetilde{K}^\theta + (\partial_{\theta_i} A^\theta)(\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_j + (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)(\bar{S}_{:,o}^\theta)_i + A^\theta M_{ij}^\theta]H, \\ A^{\theta,0,0} &:= A^{\theta,1,1} := A^{\theta,2,2} := F^\theta, \\ A_j^{\theta,1,0} &:= (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) - A_j^{\theta,1}, \\ A_{ij}^{\theta,2,0} &:= (\partial_{\theta_i} \partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) - A_{ij}^{\theta,2}, \\ A_j^{\theta,2,1} &:= (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)(I - \widetilde{K}^\theta H) + A^\theta N_j^\theta H. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ ,  $V^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ ,  $W^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  differ from  $\widehat{X}^\theta$ ,  $V^\theta$ ,  $W^\theta$  only in the sense that the time-dependent coefficients  $A^{\theta,1}(t)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $A^{\theta,2,2}(t)$  are replaced by their limits  $A^{\theta,1}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $A^{\theta,2,2}$ . Observe further that  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}} = (X, \widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}, V^{\theta,\text{hom}})$  as well as  $\underline{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}} := (X, \widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}, V^{\theta,\text{hom}}, W^{\theta,\text{hom}})$  are polynomial

state space models of order 2 by Proposition 2.14 in Kallsen and Richert [73]. Proposition 5.6 and 5.13 show that they are ergodic with respect to unique stationary laws  $\bar{\mu}_\vartheta$  resp.  $\underline{\mu}_\vartheta$ .

Define the functions  $f^\vartheta : E \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $\tilde{f}^\vartheta : E \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times k} \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times k \times k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  by

$$f^\vartheta(\xi, \alpha, \beta)_j := -\frac{1}{2} \left( \kappa_j + 2\beta_{0,j}^\top (\widehat{\Sigma}_0^\vartheta)^{-1} \varepsilon - \varepsilon^\top \widetilde{S}_{0,j}^\vartheta \varepsilon \right), \quad (3.6)$$

$$\tilde{f}^\vartheta(\xi, \alpha, \beta, \gamma)_{ij} := -\frac{1}{2} \left( \mu_{ij} + 2\nu_{ij} \varepsilon + \varepsilon^\top \psi_{ij} \varepsilon + 2\beta_{0,j}^\top (\widehat{\Sigma}_0^\vartheta)^{-1} \beta_{0,i} \right), \quad (3.7)$$

where we define the shorthand  $\varepsilon := \xi_0 - \alpha_0$ . These functions stand for the time-homogeneous counterparts of the quadratic functions defining  $Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)$  and  $\nabla_\vartheta Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)$  in Propositions 3.5 and 3.6. Moreover, we define the quadratic function  $g^\vartheta : E \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  as the solution to the Poisson equation  $f^\vartheta = \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta - g^\vartheta$ , where  $\bar{P}_\vartheta$  denotes the transition function of  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}} = (X, \widehat{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}, V^{\vartheta, \text{hom}})$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ . Finally, set  $h^\vartheta := \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta$ , i.e.  $h^\vartheta(x) = \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(x) = \int g^\vartheta(x) \bar{P}_\vartheta(x, dy)$ . These functions actually coincide with the ones from Proposition 3.9 and can be computed using the Tracy–Singh product. In particular,  $g^\vartheta$  exists in the first place, see the proof of Proposition 3.9.

**Theorem 3.11.** *Suppose that  $\vartheta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$ . Then the matrices in Theorem 3.4 are of the form*

$$U_\vartheta = \int (g^\vartheta(x) g^\vartheta(x)^\top - h^\vartheta(x) h^\vartheta(x)^\top) \bar{\mu}_\vartheta(dx),$$

$$W(\vartheta) = \int \tilde{f}^\vartheta(x) d\underline{\mu}_\vartheta(dx).$$

As a consequence, these matrices can be computed as follows if Assumption A' holds:

**Algorithm 3.12.** *Step 1:* Since  $X$  is a polynomial state space model of order 4, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_\vartheta(X(t)^\lambda | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{N}_4^d} b_{\lambda, \mu} X(t-1)^\mu, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}^* \quad (3.8)$$

for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_4^d$ , with some  $b_{\lambda, \mu} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $b_{\lambda, \mu} = 0$  if  $|\mu| > |\lambda|$ , see Kallsen and Richert [73, Lemma 2.10]. If  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is obtained by sampling a 4-polynomial process  $(X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  at non-negative integer time points, the  $b_{\lambda, \mu}$  are obtained from the corresponding continuous-time coefficients by using the moment formula, see Kallsen and Richert [73, Lemma 2.15]. These continuous-time coefficients can in turn be calculated with equation (6.52) in Eberlein and Kallsen [44] from the local semimartingale characteristics of  $X$ . This is particularly easy for affine processes, see Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Example 6.30].

*Step 2:* By Kallsen and Richert [73, Proposition 2.14], (3.8) holds also for the processes  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}} = (X, \widehat{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}, V^{\vartheta, \text{hom}})$  and  $\underline{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}} = (X, \widehat{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}, V^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}, W^{\vartheta, \text{hom}})$ . This result also shows how to obtain the corresponding coefficients  $b_{\lambda, \mu}$  for these processes from the ones for  $X$ .

*Step 3:* Since  $f^\vartheta$  is an explicitly given polynomial of order 2, its expectation  $W(\vartheta)$  under the stationary law of  $\underline{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}} = (X, \widehat{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}, V^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}, W^{\vartheta, \text{hom}})$  can now be computed explicitly with the moment formula, see Kallsen and Richert [73, Proposition 2.11 and equation (2.5)].

*Step 4:* The coefficients of the quadratic polynomials  $g^\vartheta$  and  $h^\vartheta$  are provided explicitly in Proposition 3.9. The multinomial theorem then yields the coefficients of the quartic polynomial  $x \mapsto g^\vartheta(x) g^\vartheta(x)^\top - h^\vartheta(x) h^\vartheta(x)^\top$ , needed for the computation of  $U_\vartheta$ , see Theorem 3.11.

*Step 5:* The expectation  $U_\vartheta$  of this quartic polynomial under the unique stationary law of  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}} = (X, \widehat{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}, V^{\vartheta, \text{hom}})$  can now also be obtained explicitly from the moment formula, see Kallsen and Richert [73, Proposition 2.11 and equation (2.5)].

Since the true parameter  $\vartheta$  is unknown, we approximate it by its consistent estimator  $\widehat{\theta}(t)$  to apply Algorithm 3.12. A Slutsky-type argument yields the following central limit theorem.

**Proposition 3.13.** *Suppose that  $\vartheta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$  and Assumption A' holds. Then  $V_{\widehat{\theta}(t)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} V_\vartheta$  and*

$$\sqrt{t}V_{\widehat{\theta}(t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta-d} Y$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with  $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_k)$ . Here, we set  $V^{-\frac{1}{2}} := 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  if  $V_{\widehat{\theta}(t)}$  is not invertible.

### 3.4 Asymptotic confidence intervals and tests

Once the covariance matrix  $V_\vartheta$  has been consistently estimated by  $\widehat{V}(t) := V_{\widehat{\theta}(t)}$  from Section 3.3 or  $\widehat{V}(t) := \widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  from Section 3.2, it can be used to calculate asymptotic confidence intervals for the components of  $\vartheta$ . In particular, for  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , the symmetric interval

$$\left[ \widehat{\theta}(t)_j - \sqrt{\frac{\widehat{V}(t)_{jj}}{t}} \Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right), \widehat{\theta}(t)_j + \sqrt{\frac{\widehat{V}(t)_{jj}}{t}} \Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right]$$

covers the true parameter value  $\vartheta_j$  with a probability converging to  $1 - \alpha$ , where  $\Phi^{-1}(\alpha)$  denotes the standard normal  $\alpha$ -quantile. One-sided intervals and multivariate elliptic confidence regions can be constructed in a similar manner. Alternatively, it might be of interest to simultaneously test  $m \leq k$  non-linear constraints on  $\vartheta$  in the form of a hypothesis

$$H_0 : R(\vartheta) = r,$$

where  $r \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $R : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  is continuously differentiable with Jacobian  $\nabla_\theta R : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$  such that  $\text{rank}(\nabla_\theta R(\theta)) = m$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Most of the testing principles used in applied mathematics to test such hypotheses are based on the Wald test, the Lagrange multiplier (LM) test, also called score test or Rao-score test, and the likelihood-ratio (LR) test, also called Wilks test, see Engle [46]. The latter two require the use of a constrained estimator which we conveniently define to be any  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable  $\Theta$ -valued random variable  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t)$  such that  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t) \in \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta_c} L^\theta(t)$ , where  $\Theta_c := \{\theta \in \Theta : R(\theta) = r\}$ .<sup>1</sup> We further make the assumption that, under  $H_0$ , the sequence  $(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is weakly  $\vartheta$ -consistent and moreover that  $(\sqrt{t}(\widehat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta), \sqrt{t}(\widehat{\theta}^c(t) - \vartheta))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is jointly asymptotically normal. In this case, since  $\vartheta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$ , the Lagrange multiplier theorem (see e.g. Fitzpatrick [57, Theorem 17.17]) and consistency imply that, with probability converging to 1,  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t)$  solves the Lagrangian equations  $\frac{1}{t}Z^\theta(t) = \nabla_\theta R(\theta)^\top \widehat{\lambda}(t)$  and  $R(\theta) = r$  together with some  $\mathbb{R}^m$ -valued Lagrange multiplier variable  $\widehat{\lambda}(t)$ .

**Proposition 3.14.** *Assume that  $\vartheta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$  and that both  $U_\vartheta$  and  $W(\vartheta)$  are invertible. Then the following conclusion holds under  $H_0$ , where the occurring statistic  $\xi_{\text{Wald}}(t)$  is defined to take the value 0 on the set  $\{\widehat{V}(t) \text{ is singular}\}$ , whose probability converges to 0.*

1. *The Wald test statistic  $\xi_{\text{Wald}}(t) := t [R(\theta) - r]^\top [\nabla_\theta R(\theta) \widehat{V}(t) \nabla_\theta R(\theta)^\top]^{-1} [R(\theta) - r] \Big|_{\theta = \widehat{\theta}(t)}$  satisfies  $\xi_{\text{Wald}}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta-d} \Xi$ , where  $\Xi$  follows a  $\chi^2$ -distribution with  $m$  degrees of freedom.*

<sup>1</sup>Since  $R$  is a continuous function and since  $\Theta$  is compact, the constrained set  $\Theta_c$  is compact as well, so the existence of measurable constrained QML estimators follows once more from Jennrich [71, Lemma 2].

Set  $\widehat{V}^c(t) := \widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}^c(t)]$ ,  $\widehat{W}^c(t) := \widehat{W}_t[\widehat{\theta}^c(t)]$  or  $\widehat{V}^c(t) := V_{\widehat{\theta}^c(t)}$ ,  $\widehat{W}^c(t) := W_{\widehat{\theta}^c(t)}$ , depending on whether the approach in Section 3.2 or Section 3.3 is chosen. Suppose further that  $R \in C^2(\Theta, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and that the objects in Assumption A are  $C^4$ -functions. Let  $\Sigma_{\widehat{V}} := \nabla_{\theta} R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) \widehat{V}^c(t) \nabla_{\theta} R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))^{\top}$ ,  $\Sigma_V := \nabla_{\theta} R(\vartheta) V_{\vartheta} \nabla_{\theta} R(\vartheta)^{\top}$ , and  $\Sigma_W := \nabla_{\theta} R(\vartheta) W(\vartheta)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} R(\vartheta)^{\top}$ . Then the following two statements hold under  $H_0$ , where we set  $\xi_{\text{LM}}(t) := 0$  on the set  $\{\widehat{V}^c(t) \text{ is singular}\}$ :

2. The LM test statistic  $\xi_{\text{LM}}(t) := \frac{1}{t} Z^{\theta}(t) \widehat{W}^c(t)^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} R(\theta) \Sigma_{\widehat{V}}^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} R(\theta)^{\top} \widehat{W}^c(t)^{-1} Z^{\theta}(t) \Big|_{\theta = \widehat{\theta}^c(t)}$  satisfies  $\xi_{\text{LM}}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta-d}} \Xi$ , where  $\Xi$  follows a  $\chi^2$ -distribution with  $m$  degrees of freedom.
3. Similarly, the LR test statistic  $\xi_{\text{LR}}(t) := -2 \log(\varphi_t)$  satisfies  $\xi_{\text{LR}}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta-d}} \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j Z_j^2$ , where  $\varphi_t := \exp(L^{\widehat{\theta}^c(t)} - L^{\widehat{\theta}(t)})$  is the quasi-likelihood ratio and, for  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $Z_j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $\lambda_j$  are the eigenvalues of  $[-W(\vartheta)]^{-1/2} \nabla_{\theta} R(\vartheta)^{\top} \Sigma_W^{-1} \Sigma_V \Sigma_W^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} R(\vartheta) [-W(\vartheta)]^{-1/2}$ .

**Remark 3.15.** Above we assumed that the sequence of constrained QML estimators  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t)$  is consistent and, jointly with  $\widehat{\theta}(t)$ , asymptotically normal under  $H_0$ . This can be naturally motivated by the following construction, which assumes that the hypothesis can be parameterised by some lower-dimensional space: Suppose that there exists a convex and compact set  $\widetilde{\Theta}_c \in \mathbb{R}^{k'}$  with non-empty interior, where  $0 \leq k' \leq k$ , and some bijection  $h \in C^3(\widetilde{\Theta}_c, \Theta)$  such that  $\text{rank}(\nabla_{\eta} h(\eta)) = k'$  for any  $\eta \in \widetilde{\Theta}_c$ . Then it is easy to check that all conditions of the main theorems 3.3 and 3.4 are fulfilled for the estimation model with lower-dimensional parameter space  $\widetilde{\Theta}_c$  and so, under  $H_0$ ,  $\widehat{\eta}(t) \in \arg \max_{\eta \in \widetilde{\Theta}_c} L^{h(\eta)}(t)$  is consistent and asymptotically normal for the unique value  $\eta^*$  such that  $h(\eta^*) = \vartheta$ . Consequently, also  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t) = h(\widehat{\eta}(t))$  is  $\vartheta$ -consistent and asymptotically normal, and the joint asymptotic normality assumption follows by considering estimation of  $(\vartheta, \eta^*)$  on the parameter space  $\Theta \times \widetilde{\Theta}_c$ .

Compared to the likelihood-ratio test, the Lagrange multiplier test has the advantage that only the constrained estimator  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t)$  has to be evaluated instead of both the constrained and unconstrained estimator. Additionally and in contrast to the well-known simple results obtained for maximum likelihood estimation using independent and identically distributed random variables, the asymptotic distribution of the likelihood-ratio test is more complicated than that of the Wald and Lagrange multiplier test. It can be computed using various numerical algorithms, see for example Davies [33], Farebrother [48], Imhof [68] or Liu et al. [80].

## 4 Examples

In this section we illustrate the QML approach by applying it to two affine models from finance. In Section 4.1 we study the popular Heston model, where the variance process is unobservable. In Section 4.2 we consider a Lévy-driven two-factor short rate interest model by viewing it as an instance of a general multivariate Lévy-driven Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

### 4.1 The Heston stochastic volatility model

In the stochastic volatility model of Heston [63], the asset  $S = (S(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  incorporates a stochastic variance component  $v = (v(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  which is driven by a square-root diffusion. More specifically, it is assumed that  $(v, S)$  follows the dynamics

$$dv(t) = \kappa(m - v(t))dt + \sigma \sqrt{v(t)} dW^{(2)}(t), \quad (4.1)$$

$$dS(t) = (\mu + \delta v(t))S(t)dt + \sqrt{v(t)}S(t)dW^{(1)}(t) \quad (4.2)$$

under the physical probability measure  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , where  $W^{(1)}$  and  $W^{(2)}$  are two Brownian motions with correlation  $\rho \in [-1, 1]$ . This way, the volatility process exhibits a mean reversion behaviour at the rate  $\kappa \in (0, \infty)$  towards the long run variance  $m \in (0, \infty)$ . The parameter  $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$  acts as a so-called volatility of volatility, while  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  describes the drift rate of the asset  $S$  and  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$  is a parameter controlling the volatility response to the drift. Existence and uniqueness of a non-negative strong solution to the stochastic differential equation (4.1) for any  $v(0) \geq 0$  follows for example as in Ikeda and Watanabe [67, Example IV.8.2]. Since  $S$  can be expressed as the exponential of a stochastic integral of  $v$ , (4.2) also admits a unique strong solution. Instead of the equation (4.2) for the asset  $S$  itself, we can also consider the log-spot process  $Y = (Y(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  with  $Y(t) := \log S(t)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , described by the equation

$$dY(t) = \left( \mu + \left[ \delta - \frac{1}{2} \right] v(t) \right) dt + \sqrt{v(t)} dW^{(1)}(t). \quad (4.3)$$

Then  $(v, Y)$  is a bivariate affine process described by the local semimartingale characteristics

$$(b^{\text{id}}(t), c(t), v(t)) = \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \kappa m \\ \mu \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} -\kappa \\ \delta - \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} v(t), \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2 & \sigma \rho \\ \sigma \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix} v(t), 0 \right].$$

It is not hard to see that the corresponding generalised Riccati equations are explicitly solvable in the case of the Heston model  $(v, Y)$ , see Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Section 8.2.4].

Since both the joint likelihood of  $Y(t)$  and  $v(t)$  as well as the marginal likelihood of  $Y(t)$  are unknown in explicit form in the Heston model, estimation of the model parameters  $\mu, \delta, \kappa, m, \sigma, \rho$  is a non-trivial task. Since the Heston model belongs to the class of affine stochastic volatility models, its characteristic function can be derived from the affine model structure and the corresponding density can be obtained by classic Fourier inversion techniques from the characteristic function (see e.g. Bates [13]), which is however a time-consuming numerical task. Alternatively, estimation in the Heston model can solely be based on empirical estimates of the characteristic function as for example in Jiang and Knight [72] or Singleton [103], or Fourier inversion-based methods can be applied to calibrate the model parameters directly to observed option prices. The latter approach however determines the model parameters under an equivalent martingale measure, a so-called risk-neutral measure, see for example Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Section 11.2.3], while estimation routines based on observed returns like maximum likelihood or least squares minimisation procedures fit the model parameters under the true physical measure driving the returns.

Estimation in the latter case essentially boils down to a filtering problem and often consists in computing an approximate density of discretely observable quantities. Due to their simplicity, Gaussian density approximations enjoy particular popularity in the field of estimating multivariate diffusions or affine models like the Heston model, see for example Duffee [39], Fisher and Gilles [56], Hurn et al. [66], or Wang et al. [112]. Alternatively, method of moments estimators for the latent volatility process can be employed as in Bollerslev and Zhou [23].

We now aim to express the Heston model as a polynomial state space model in the sense of Definition 2.1. For computational simplicity, we consider fixed drift parameter  $\mu = 0$  and volatility response parameter  $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$  so that the log-spot process  $Y$  from (4.3) has the form

$$dY(t) = \sqrt{v(t)} dW^{(1)}(t), \quad (4.4)$$

which is a martingale. Then  $\Delta Y = (Y(t) - Y(t-1))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the discretely observed log-returns process in this Heston model.<sup>2</sup> Since  $v$  only affects the returns  $\Delta Y$  through their conditional variance, it makes sense to base the parameter estimation in the Heston model not only on the observed returns  $\Delta Y$ , but also on the squared returns  $(\Delta Y)^2 := (\Delta Y(t)^2)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Simple calculations then show that  $X := (v, \Delta Y, (\Delta Y)^2)$  with  $v = (v(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\theta = (\kappa, m, \sigma, \rho)$  is a polynomial state space model with proper state space  $E = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y = x^2\}$ . The compact parameter space  $\Theta$  is chosen as  $\Theta = I_\kappa \times I_m \times I_\sigma \times I_\rho := [10^{-4}, 10] \times [10^{-8}, 1] \times [10^{-4}, 1] \times [-1, 1]$ . For the following simulation studies, we assume  $X(0)$  to be externally known, which corresponds to a Dirac distribution as the initial law for  $X(0)$ . Of course, our setup from Section 2 also admits other arbitrary choices of initial distributions.

Since the distribution of  $v(s+t)$  given  $v(s)$  with  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  is that of  $c_t$  times a non-central chi-square distribution with  $\frac{4\kappa m}{\sigma^2}$  degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter  $\frac{v(s)}{c_t} e^{-\kappa t}$ , where  $c_t = \frac{1}{4\kappa} \sigma^2 (1 - e^{-\kappa t})$  (see Alfonsi [4]), the state transition vector and matrix of  $X$  are

$$a^\theta = m \begin{pmatrix} 1 - e^{-\kappa} \\ 0 \\ 1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}(1 - e^{-\kappa}) \end{pmatrix} \quad A^\theta = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\kappa} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\kappa}(1 - e^{-\kappa}) & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now turn to a brief justification of the assumptions introduced in Section 2.1 in the case of the Heston model. Since the affine characteristics of  $(X, Y)$  are smooth functions of  $\theta$ , the same holds for the state transition vector and matrix  $a_{\otimes r}^\theta$  and  $A_{\otimes r}^\theta$  by the moment formula Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Theorem 6.26] for any  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\Delta Y(1)$  possesses a positive density with respect to Lebesgue measure given<sup>3</sup>  $\Delta Y(0)$  and since the distribution of  $v(1)$  given  $v(0)$  under any  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  is explicitly known and equivalent to Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  if  $\kappa, m, \sigma$  are positive,  $X(1)$  has a density with respect to two-dimensional Hausdorff measure on  $E$  given  $X(0)$ . Moreover, since  $(v(t), Y(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  is affine, it possesses the Feller property (see Duffie et al. [40, Theorem 2.7]), which then also holds for  $X$ . Hence, Assumptions A' and B.1 are fulfilled provided  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(v(0))$  and  $\text{Var}_\theta(v(0))$  are  $C^3$ -functions of  $\theta$ . Concerning Assumption B.2, note that from the knowledge of the distributions of  $v(t)$  it follows that  $v$  has bounded moments of all orders, and so, by the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality (see e.g. Revuz and Yor [94, Corollary 4.2] or Theorem A.22), there is  $C_p > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta(|\Delta Y(t)|^p) = \mathbb{E}_\theta \left( \left| \int_{t-1}^t \sqrt{v(s)} dW^{(1)}(s) \right|^p \right) \leq C_p \mathbb{E}_\theta \left( \left| \int_{t-1}^t v(s) ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \leq C_p \int_{t-1}^t \mathbb{E}_\theta(v(s)^{\frac{p}{2}}) ds$$

for any  $p \geq 2$ . Hence  $X$  is bounded in any  $L^p(\mathbb{P}_\theta)$  and Assumption B.2 is fulfilled. Likewise, Assumption C' holds true for the Heston model because the asymptotic covariance matrix  $\Lambda_\circ^\theta$  of  $X_\circ$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  is identifiable, where  $\Lambda^\theta$  solves  $\Lambda^\theta = A^\theta \Lambda^\theta A^\theta + C^\theta$ .

**Remark 4.1.** Instead of considering squared returns  $(\Delta Y)^2$  in the specification of the Heston model as a polynomial state space model, one could also consider the quantities  $\Delta Y^2$ , i.e. differences of the squared log-spot, or both. Additionally, higher order versions of both quantities could be added as additional components to  $X$ , incorporating higher powers of returns in the

<sup>2</sup>We assume  $Y(-1)$  to be given for this purpose.

<sup>3</sup>See for example the considerations in Del Baño Rollin et al. [34] or use methods from Malliavin calculus, for example Corollary 3.3 in Nourdin and Viens [88] together with the expressions from Section 3.3 in Alòs and Lorige [6].

estimation framework. We did not test the effect of these model modifications concerning the efficiency of the resulting quasi-maximum likelihood estimator, say by examining the resulting differences in size of the asymptotic variances of the estimator components. However, the simultaneous use of first and second powers  $\Delta Y$  and  $(\Delta Y)^2$  is crucial for identifiability of the parameters  $\sigma$  and  $\rho$ : if  $X = (v, \Delta Y)$ , then neither  $\sigma$  nor  $\rho$  influence the asymptotic distribution of the Gaussian equivalent, which are hence non-identifiable and cannot be estimated. If, on the other hand, estimation is based only on the squared returns, i.e.  $X = (v, (\Delta Y)^2)$ , then  $\sigma$  is estimable but only  $\rho^2$  is identifiable, i.e. the strength of correlation between the asset and the volatility becomes estimable but not its sign. If the parameter  $\delta$  is set to a different value than  $\frac{1}{2}$ , then  $(v, \Delta Y, (\Delta Y)^2)$  ceases to be a polynomial state space model and  $(v, v^2, \Delta Y, (\Delta Y)^2)$  needs to be used instead.

Since the Assumptions A', B and C' are fulfilled in the case of the Heston model, Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 yields consistency of any quasi-maximum likelihood estimator sequence and also asymptotic normality, provided that the asymptotic Fisher information matrix  $W(\vartheta)$  is invertible. This condition can be justified easily using the explicit calculations from Algorithm 3.12. To visualise the content of Theorem 3.3, we let  $\vartheta = (\kappa^*, m^*, \sigma^*, \rho^*) := (1, 0.4^2, 0.3, -0.5)$  and  $X(0) = (v(0), \Delta Y(0), \Delta Y(0)^2) = (0.3^2, 0, 0)$  and simulate  $N = 10\,000$  independent trajectories  $(X^\vartheta(t))_{t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T\}}$  of size  $T = 200\,000$  using the programming language Python. The employed discretisation scheme for the equations (4.1) and (4.4) is the standard Euler–Maruyama method with step size  $\Delta t = \frac{1}{250}$ , with the addition that at each step of the discretisation the function  $x^+ = \max\{x, 0\}$  is used to ensure non-negativity of the variance (this is termed the absorption scheme in Lord et al. [81] who compare different simulation schemes for the Heston model). We first focus solely on the estimation of the parameter  $\sigma$ , assuming all other parameters to be known. Figure 2 shows ten independent sequences  $(\hat{\sigma}(t))_{t \in \{1, \dots, T\}}$  of the resulting quasi-maximum likelihood estimator, first if the variance component  $v$  is assumed to be unobservable and secondly if the variance component  $v$  can be observed.

Here it is visible that the absence of additional observable components significantly increases the estimator standard deviation by approximately a factor of 10. We suffer from




Figure 2: Ten sequences of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators for the parameter  $\sigma^* = 0.3$ . On the left  $v$  is assumed to be unobservable, while on the right  $v$  is assumed to be observable.



another increase in variance if the whole parameter  $\vartheta$  rather than only  $\sigma$  is unknown. The tiles of Figure 3 each contain five standard deviation sequences for the estimator components, obtained from  $\widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  introduced in Section 3.2, first for an isolated estimation of the parameter components and secondly for the joint estimation. The horizontal black lines show the explicit computation of the standard deviation components using Algorithm 3.12 from Section 3.3. In the case of the joint estimation, the asymptotic standard deviation for  $\widehat{\sigma}(t)$  is larger by approximately a factor of 1.5 compared to the isolated estimation. Interestingly however,




Figure 3: Five sequences of estimator standard deviations, obtained from the covariance estimates  $\widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  for  $t$  between 1 and  $20 \cdot 10^6$ . The left column displays the standard deviation in the case of an isolated estimation of the parameters  $\kappa^*$ ,  $m^*$ ,  $\sigma^*$  and  $\rho^*$ , assuming all other parameters to be known. The right column displays the standard deviation in the case of a joint estimation of the parameter  $\vartheta = (\kappa^*, m^*, \sigma^*, \rho^*)$ . Black lines show values obtained from the explicit calculations detailed in Section 3.3.

a reversed effect can be observed for the other parameters  $\kappa$ ,  $m$ ,  $\rho$ , the estimation of which becomes more accurate in the joint estimation case.

For the case of joint estimation, Figure 4 contains the sequences of correlations between the estimator components, obtained from  $\widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$ , again accompanied by the explicit calculations from Section 3.3 using black horizontal lines. Another visible fact from Figures 3 or 4 is the potentially low speed of convergence of the asymptotic covariance estimator. In Figure 3 about  $t = 10^7$  observations are necessary for the covariance estimator to reach a stable state with acceptable accuracy compared to the explicit calculations. This is a potential drawback of the easily computable estimators  $\widehat{V}_t[\theta]$  that we introduced in Section 3.2, which have a rather high variance due to the occurrence of empirical fourth moments of  $X$  in the expression of the estimator  $\widehat{U}_t[\theta]$ . In practice, it is rather unlikely that such a large history of data is available for estimation. In this case, once the parameter  $\vartheta$  of the model has been consistently estimated from data by  $\widehat{\theta}(t)$ , a bootstrap procedure can be used. To this end, one simulates a large history of synthetic data from the presumed model using the fitted parameter and uses the simulated history to estimate the asymptotic covariance matrix of the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator as in Figure 3. This discussion once more emphasises the advantages of our explicit calculations from Algorithm 3.12 in Section 3.3.

In the case of an isolated estimation of the parameter  $\sigma$ , the explicit calculation of the asymptotic covariance matrix reveals an asymptotic estimator standard deviation of approximately  $\text{Std}^*[\widehat{\sigma}] \approx 3.2871$  for  $\widehat{\sigma}(t)$ . We can validate this calculation by visualising the empirical distribution of the  $N = 10\,000$  independent estimators  $\widehat{\sigma}^{(i)}(T)$  for  $T = 200\,000$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . This is shown in Figure 5, which displays a histogram of the 10 000 estimators along with the Gaussian density with mean  $\sigma^* = 0.3$  and standard deviation  $\frac{\text{Std}^*[\widehat{\sigma}]}{\sqrt{200\,000}}$  and next to a density estimate of the empirical distribution using a Gaussian kernel density estimator with bandwidth selection according to Scott [101]. A D’Agostino–Pearson test (see D’Agostino and Pearson




Figure 4: For each pair of estimator components, the figure displays five independent sequences of estimator correlations, respectively obtained from the covariance estimates  $\widehat{V}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  for  $t$  varying between 1 and  $20 \cdot 10^6$ , and a little less rigorously called  $\text{Corr}^*[\cdot, \cdot]$  to denote the asymptotic correlation between the estimator components in the square brackets. Black lines show values obtained from the explicit calculations detailed in Section 3.3.

[32]) does not reject the normality of the sample at any reasonable level with a  $p$ -value of approximately 0.6479. The mean of the empirical distribution is approximately 0.2997 with a standard deviation of  $\frac{3.2974}{\sqrt{200\,000}}$ , validating the standard deviation calculation: a two-sided chi-square test does not reject the hypothesis  $\text{Var}(\hat{\sigma}(200\,000)) = \frac{3.2871^2}{200\,000}$  at any reasonable level with a  $p$ -value<sup>4</sup> of approximately 0.6512.

A further validation of the covariance calculations from Section 3.2 and Section 3.3 can be obtained by evaluating the empirical size of the Wald, Lagrange multiplier, and likelihood-ratio tests, that is, the frequency of committing a Type I error using  $N = 10\,000$  independent repetitions of the tests. Even though these tests become rather simplistic in the case of an isolated estimation of a single parameter, we include the test results for  $H_0 : \sigma^* = 0.3$  for the sake of exposition. Table 1 includes the empirical size of the tests, i.e. the frequency under  $H_0$  of the test statistics exceeding the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of the respective limiting distribution from Proposition 3.14. The number of observations included for the tests is again  $T = 200\,000$ . By the central limit theorem, these sizes are approximately distributed as  $\mathcal{N}(\alpha, \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)}{N})$  so that an asymptotic 95% confidence interval (CI) and a two-sided  $p$ -value for the sizes are given in Table 1 as well. The latter is again calculated as  $\min\{F(S), 1 - F(S)\}$ , where  $S$  is the empirical size and  $F$  is the distribution function of the  $\mathcal{N}(\alpha, \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)}{N})$  distribution. Evidently, all tests at the levels  $\alpha = 5\%$  and  $\alpha = 10\%$  yield satisfying rejection frequencies. However, the rejection frequencies at  $\alpha = 1\%$  exceed the confidence range for the size, indicating a slightly downward-biased variance estimate  $\hat{V}(t) = V_{\hat{\theta}(t)}$ . These findings are roughly in line with the test results obtained by Boubacar Maïnassara [24] for the estimation of weak VARMA models.

**Remark 4.2.** It is also possible to estimate the parameters of a Heston model on a small time




Figure 5: Histogram of  $N = 10\,000$  independent quasi-maximum likelihood estimators  $\hat{\sigma}^{(i)}(200\,000)$ . On top we draw the density of the normal distribution with mean  $\sigma^* = 0.3$  and variance given by the explicit calculation of  $V_g$  in green as well as a kernel density estimate of the estimators  $\hat{\sigma}^{(i)}(T)$  in red. The black dotted line indicates the true value  $\sigma^* = 0.3$ .

<sup>4</sup>Since the asymptotic distribution of the test is sufficiently symmetric, we use the definition  $p = 2 \min\{F(S), 1 - F(S)\}$  for the two-sided  $p$ -value of a test with asymptotic distribution function  $F$  and test statistic  $S$ .

Level	Wald test	LM test	LR test	95% CI for the size
$\alpha = 1\%$	1.27% ( $p = 0.0067$ )	1.30% ( $p = 0.0026$ )	1.30% ( $p = 0.0026$ )	[0.805%, 1.195%]
$\alpha = 5\%$	5.32% ( $p = 0.1420$ )	5.39% ( $p = 0.0735$ )	5.39% ( $p = 0.0735$ )	[4.573%, 5.427%]
$\alpha = 10\%$	10.44% ( $p = 0.1425$ )	10.54% ( $p = 0.0719$ )	10.53% ( $p = 0.0773$ )	[9.412%, 10.588%]

Table 1: Frequency of rejection under the null  $H_0 : \sigma^* = 0.3$  for the Wald, the LM and the LR test. Asymptotically, these sizes of the tests fall theoretically within the given confidence intervals in the fifth column with a probability of 95%.  $p$ -values of the sizes are given below.

scale. To this end, one may define the polynomial state space model  $X = (\tilde{v}, \Delta Y, (\Delta Y)^2)$  with  $\tilde{v}(k) := v(k\Delta t)$  and  $\Delta Y(k) := Y(k\Delta t) - Y(k\Delta t - \Delta t)$  for some small fixed time increment  $\Delta t$ . For  $\Delta t = \frac{1}{24000}$ , which roughly corresponds to a five-minute interval of observations if time is measured in years, one obtains the asymptotic standard deviation  $\text{Std}^*[\hat{\sigma}] \approx 160.0723$  for the example of an isolated estimation of the volatility of volatility  $\sigma$ . The asymptotic accuracy can potentially be improved by incorporating higher powers of the variance and the returns to the state space model in order to leverage the information contained in higher moments of  $v$  and  $Y$ . For example, if one uses  $X = (\tilde{v}, \tilde{v}^2, \Delta Y, (\Delta Y)^2, (\Delta Y)^4)$  with the first two components treated as unobservable, one obtains  $\text{Std}^*[\hat{\sigma}] \approx 81.8182$ .

## 4.2 Multivariate Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes

In this section we study the estimation of Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes driven by a multivariate Lévy process. The univariate Gaussian Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process was initially proposed by Uhlenbeck and Ornstein [108] in a physical environment and motivated in this context by its mean-reverting properties. Since then, multiple generalisations to the classic Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process have appeared in the literature including those driven by a general Lévy process, as initially proposed by Sato and Yamazato [96] and Sato and Yamazato [98]. As in Masuda [83] we define a  $d$ -dimensional analogue of a univariate Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process as a strong solution to the stochastic differential equation

$$dX(t) = -QX(t) dt + dL(t) \quad (4.5)$$

on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , where  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $L = (L(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  is a  $d$ -dimensional Lévy process, usually called the *background driving Lévy process*. This family of models has a wide range of applications. A particularly prominent one in financial economics lies in the stochastic volatility specification of the well-known Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard [11] model, but other motivations for studying processes of the form (4.5) include the modelling of energy prices and derivatives (see for example Benth et al. [16]) or of the so-called storage equation from storage theory (see Çinlar and Pinsky [27]). Multivariate Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes have for example been applied to the phenomenon of co-integration in econometrics by Fasen [49]. We can state the following standard result:

**Proposition 4.3.** *Given  $X(0)$ , the unique strong solution to the stochastic differential equation (4.5) is of the form  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  with  $X(t) = e^{-Qt} X(0) + \int_0^t e^{-Q(t-s)} dL(s)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .*

For an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process  $X$ , it can be shown that the distribution of  $X(t)$  is infinitely divisible and that the conditional characteristic function of  $X(t)$  given  $\mathcal{F}_s$  is given by

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{iu^\top X(t)} \mid \mathcal{F}_s\right] = \exp\left[iu^\top e^{-Q(t-s)}X(s) + \int_s^t \psi^L(e^{-Q^\top(t-r)}u) dr\right] \quad (4.6)$$

(see e.g. Sato and Yamazato [97, Theorem 3.1]), where  $\psi^L$  denotes the characteristic exponent of  $L$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is the natural filtration of  $X$ . Thus,  $X$  is an affine process and we can apply the theory developed in Sections 2 and 3 to the estimation of an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process  $X$  defined in terms of some  $Q^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and some  $d$ -dimensional Lévy process  $L$  whose law under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  depends on  $\theta$ . Concerning the latter assumption we have the following simple condition:

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $X$  be an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process with background driving Lévy process  $L$ . Let  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and suppose that  $\mathbb{E}(\|L(1)\|^p) < \infty$  (or equivalently  $\int_{\|x\| \geq 1} \|x\|^p \nu^L(dx) < \infty$ , where  $\nu^L$  is the Lévy measure of  $L$ ). Then  $\mathbb{E}(\|X(t)\|^p) < \infty$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . If moreover  $\alpha(Q) > 0$ , i.e.  $Q$  has only eigenvalues with positive real parts, then  $X$  is bounded in  $L^p$ .*

The preceding proposition shows that the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck polynomial state space model  $(\tilde{X}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $\tilde{X}(k) = X(k\Delta t)$  defined by some matrix  $Q^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , some  $d$ -dimensional Lévy process  $L$ , and some step size  $\Delta t$  is a parametric polynomial state space model of order  $r$  if  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\|L(1)\|^r) < \infty$  for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ . By slight abuse of notation, we will write  $X$  for both the continuous-time Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process  $(X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  and the state space model  $\tilde{X}$  with step size  $\Delta t$ , even though the time scales generally differ. It is then possible to express the state transition matrix and state transition vector  $A^\theta$  and  $a^\theta$  as well as the noise covariance matrices  $C^\theta(t)$  from Proposition 2.6 in closed form if  $Q^\theta$  is assumed to be non-singular. To do so one only needs expressions for the expectation and the covariance matrix of  $L(1)$ , which are easily obtained for most common Lévy processes:

**Proposition 4.5.** *Assume that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\|L(1)\|^2) < \infty$  for any  $\theta \in \Theta$  and set  $a_\theta^L := \mathbb{E}_\theta(L(1))$  as well as  $c_\theta^L := \text{Cov}_\theta(L(1))$ . Assume that the matrix  $Q^\theta$  is non-singular for any  $\theta \in \Theta$  and define the long-run mean  $\mu_\infty^\theta := (Q^\theta)^{-1}a_\theta^L$ . Then the state transition vector and state transition matrix of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck polynomial state space model  $X$  are given by  $a^\theta = (\mathbf{I}_d - e^{-Q^\theta \Delta t})\mu_\infty^\theta$  and  $A^\theta = e^{-Q^\theta \Delta t}$ . Moreover, the noise covariance matrices  $C^\theta$  from Proposition 2.6 are independent of  $t$ :*

$$\text{vec}(C^\theta(t)) = (Q^\theta \oplus Q^\theta)^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_d - e^{-(Q^\theta \oplus Q^\theta)\Delta t})([\mu_\infty^\theta \oplus \mu_\infty^\theta]a_\theta^L + \text{vec}(c_\theta^L)) - (\mathbf{I}_d - e^{-(Q^\theta \oplus Q^\theta)\Delta t})(\mu_\infty^\theta \otimes \mu_\infty^\theta). \quad (4.7)$$

Since the expressions for the mean and covariance matrix of the Lévy process  $L$  together with  $Q^\theta$  fully determine the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator for the model, this once more puts an emphasis on the interpretation of the Gaussian quasi-maximum likelihood estimator as a sort of generalised method of moments estimator, which was given in Section 1.

**Remark 4.6.** Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes are natural generalisations of discrete-time autoregressive processes of order one and hence belong to the class of continuous-time autoregressive moving average (CARMA) processes as introduced in Doob [37]. In particular, it has been shown in Schlemm and Stelzer [99, Corollary 3.4] that multivariate CARMA processes and Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes are equivalent. Estimation of these processes is a well-developed field in the literature, including Taufer and Leonenko [106] using empirical characteristic functions and Valdivieso et al. [109] as well as Lu [82] using maximum likelihood methods in the univariate and in the multivariate setting, respectively. If the

Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process has finite second moments and is observed at discrete points in time, consistency and asymptotic normality have been shown for a standard least-squares estimator in Fasen [49, Proposition 3.2], for a method of moments estimator in Spiliopoulos [105, Theorem 4.1], and for a quasi-maximum likelihood estimator in Schlemm and Stelzer [100] under slightly different conditions than ours. Of these authors, only Schlemm and Stelzer [100] deal with partially observed Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes. On the other hand, neither of these studies seems to use the affine polynomial moment structure of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, and so the conditions for consistency and asymptotic normality in Schlemm and Stelzer [100] are based on strong mixing properties and all in all less elementary than those introduced in Section 2.1.

We will now briefly treat the fulfilment of the Assumptions A', B, C' from Section 2.1 for a parametric Ornstein–Uhlenbeck polynomial state space model  $X$  parameterised by some  $\theta \in \Theta$ , where  $\Theta$  is a convex and compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . By Proposition 4.5, Assumption A' is fulfilled whenever  $Q^\theta$ ,  $a_\theta^L$ , and  $c_\theta^L$  are  $C^3$ -functions of  $\theta$ . The identification of a suitable state space  $E$  for  $X$  such that the transition measures of  $X$  are equivalent to  $\lambda_E$  is difficult to determine in generality and depends on the chosen background-driving Lévy process  $L$ . Conditions ensuring the existence of a Lebesgue density of  $X(t)$  given  $X(t - \Delta t)$  can e.g. be found in Priola and Zabczyk [91] or Simon [102]. For example, Theorem 1.1 in the former establishes that the law of  $X(t)$  for any  $t > 0$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\lambda_d$  if the Lévy measure  $\nu^\theta$  of  $L$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  is infinite and possesses a Lebesgue density on some open neighbourhood of zero. However, these conditions do not warrant positivity of the density on all of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  or a suitable subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Under a condition which ensures that the Lévy measure  $\nu^\theta$  has sufficient mass around zero (see Priola and Zabczyk [91, Hypothesis 1.2]), the characteristic function (4.6) is integrable, and so, by the Fourier inversion formula (cf. Sato [95, Proposition 2.5(xii)]), the conditional density of  $X(t)$  is

$$f_{X(t)|X(t-\Delta t)=x}^\theta(y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp \left[ iu^\top (e^{-Q^\theta \Delta t} x - y) + \int_0^{\Delta t} \psi_\theta^L(e^{-Q^{\theta^\top} s} u) ds \right] du$$

for  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , whence positivity conditions can be derived to fully establish Assumption B.1 if a specific Lévy process  $L$  has been chosen. If  $a_\theta^L = 0$ , i.e.  $L$  is a centred Lévy process under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , then (4.7) simplifies to  $\text{vec}(C^\theta(t)) = (Q^\theta \oplus Q^\theta)^{-1} (I_d - e^{-(Q^\theta \oplus Q^\theta)\Delta t}) \text{vec}(c_\theta^L)$ , which can also be expressed as  $C^\theta(t) = \int_0^{\Delta t} e^{-Q^\theta s} c_\theta^L e^{-Q^{\theta^\top} s} ds$ , see the proof of Proposition 4.5. Together with Proposition 2.13 this shows that Assumption B.1 can fail if  $c_\theta^L$  is not positive definite for some  $\theta \in \Theta$ . The Feller property for  $X$  follows from the fact that  $X$  is obtained by sampling from an affine process or by an application of the dominated convergence theorem to the representation of  $X(t)$  from Proposition 4.3. Concerning Assumption B.2,  $L^{4+\delta}$ -boundedness follows from Proposition 4.4 if  $\alpha(Q^\theta) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\|L(1)\|^{4+\delta}) < \infty$  for some  $\delta > 0$  and all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

**Remark 4.7.** Even though we focus on Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes here, it should be rather straightforward to extend the results of this section to *Generalised Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes*, i.e. càdlàg  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued processes solving  $dX(t) = dV(t)X(t-) + dL(t)$  for some  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ -valued Lévy process  $(V, L)$  (see Behme and Lindner [15]), which are in general non-affine polynomial. In this case explicit expressions for the state transition vector and matrix can be derived using similar methods as in the proof of Proposition 4.5 or as in Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Example 6.31]. Concerning Assumptions B, the Feller property follows again from an explicit expression for the process as in Proposition 4.3 (see Behme and

Lindner [15, Theorem 3.4]) and conditions for boundedness in  $L^{4+\delta}$  can be derived by methods similar to Behme [14, Theorem 3.1] or Lindner and Maller [79, Proposition 4.1].

As a specific application of the above theory inspired by financial mathematics, we consider a Lévy-driven two-factor interest rate model for the short rate, where the short rate can be thought of as some sort of instantaneous forward interest rate with infinitesimal horizon. For details about interest rate models in general and the example considered here see Chapter 14 and Example 14.10 in Eberlein and Kallsen [44], respectively. In our case we assume that the short rate  $r = (r(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  follows an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process that incorporates a mean-reverting behaviour towards some average  $m = (m(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  that is itself random. Specifically,

$$dm(t) = -\lambda m(t) dt + dL_1(t), \quad (4.8)$$

$$dr(t) = \kappa(m(t) - r(t)) dt + dL_2(t) \quad (4.9)$$

under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , where  $\lambda, \kappa \in (0, \infty)$  and  $L = (L_1, L_2)^\top$  is a bivariate Lévy process and where  $\theta = (\lambda, \kappa, \theta_0) \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$  with some additional parameters  $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{k-2}$ . It is convenient for our purposes to assume that the short rate  $r$  can be observed from bond prices in the market and that the stochastic mean  $m$  is unobservable. This model  $X = (m, r)$  is of the form (4.5) with

$$Q^\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ -\kappa & \kappa \end{pmatrix}.$$

As a parametric family of Lévy processes  $L$  we consider bivariate normal-inverse Gaussian Lévy processes with parameters  $\mu, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\alpha, \delta \in (0, \infty)$ , where  $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$  is positive definite with  $\det(\Delta) = 1$  and  $\beta^\top \Delta \beta < \alpha^2$ , see for example Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Section 2.4.8]. The mean and covariance matrix of  $L(1)$  are given by  $a_\theta^L = \mu + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\psi}} \Delta \beta$  and  $c_\theta^L = \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\psi}} \left( \Delta + \frac{1}{\psi} \Delta \beta \beta^\top \Delta \right)$ , where  $\psi := \alpha^2 - \beta^\top \Delta \beta$ . For ease of exposition we simplify our calculations by focusing on centred and symmetric normal-inverse Gaussian Lévy processes with uncorrelated components as the background driving Lévy process, i.e. we focus on  $\mu = 0$ ,  $\beta = 0$ ,  $\Delta = I_2$ , for which  $a_\theta^L = 0$ ,  $c_\theta^L = \frac{\delta}{\alpha} I_2$ . In this case estimation of the four-dimensional parameter  $\theta = (\lambda, \kappa, \alpha, \delta)$  using the Gaussian quasi-maximum likelihood approach is not possible because the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\delta$  are not identifiable from the second moments of  $L^\theta$  but only their quotient  $\frac{\delta}{\alpha}$ , so Assumption C' is not satisfied for a separate estimation of  $\alpha$  and  $\delta$ . Hence, we confine ourselves to the estimation of the three-dimensional parameter  $\theta = (\lambda, \kappa, \delta)$  with fixed  $\alpha = 1$ .

**Remark 4.8.** In order to make inference on the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\delta$  separately, one could allow for second-order polynomials of  $r(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  rather than only  $r(t)$ . This can be achieved by replacing  $X = (m, r)$  with the higher-dimensional polynomial state-space model  $X = (r, r^2, m, mr, m^2)$ , whose components  $m, mr, m^2$  are unobservable. In the same vein, one could also estimate a non-zero parameter  $\beta$  of the underlying Lévy process. In that case all parameters of the state space model  $X = (m, r)$  would be identifiable.

Since the Assumptions A', B, C' are fulfilled for the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck model described above, Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 yield again consistency and asymptotic normality of any sequence of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators, provided that the Fisher information matrix  $W(\vartheta)$  is invertible. We again visualise this result by setting  $\vartheta = (\lambda^*, \kappa^*, \delta^*) := (1, 0.5, 3)$  and by simulating  $N = 10\,000$  independent sample trajectories  $(X^\vartheta(t))_{t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T\}}$  of size  $T = 200\,000$  with step size  $\Delta t = 1$ , where the stochastic integral from Proposition 4.3 is discretised by an

Euler method with mesh size  $\frac{1}{5000}$ . Similar to the Heston model from Section 4.1, the initial distribution for  $X(0)$  is set to a Dirac distribution in the point  $x = (0.5, 1)$  under any  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ . The parameter space  $\Theta$  is chosen as  $\Theta = [10^{-4}, 10] \times [10^{-4}, 10] \times [10^{-4}, 1000]$ . As in the case of the Heston model, we compare our results for (i) a joint estimation of  $\theta$  and (ii) an isolated estimation of the separate parameter component  $\delta$  with all other components assumed to be known. Figure 6 shows ten independent sequences  $(\hat{\delta}(t))_{t \in \{1, \dots, T\}}$  of the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator, first if the latent mean  $m$  is assumed to be unobservable and secondly if  $m$  is assumed to be observable.

Again as in the case of the Heston model, introducing additional observable components for estimation reduces the estimator's standard deviation. In the case of estimating the parameter  $\delta$  of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck model described above, the reduction in variance is however much smaller compared to the estimation of the volatility of volatility parameter  $\sigma$  in the Heston model (see Figure 2). This could potentially originate from the fact that the dispersion parameter  $\delta$  influences both components of our model equally, while in the case of the Heston model, the parameter  $\sigma$  affects the observed returns only indirectly. Similar to Figures 3 and 4, the tiles of the following Figure 7 each contain five standard deviation (or correlation) sequences for the estimator's components next to the exact calculation of the corresponding asymptotic covariance matrix components, which is depicted by a straight black line.

Recall the discussion in Section 4.1 of the potential drawback of the covariance estimator  $\hat{V}_t[\hat{\theta}(t)]$ . It becomes even more pronounced here because the large amount of around  $50 \cdot 10^6$  observations is necessary for the estimator components to reach a sufficiently stable state, as it is visible in Figure 7. Again, this demands a rather high calculation effort in practice, speaking once more for the explicit covariance matrix calculations from Section 3.3. Apart from that, all covariance estimates visible in Figure 7 are well in line with the theoretical computations from Section 3.3, except for the case of an isolated estimation of  $\delta$ , in which case the standard deviation estimate has a downward bias of around 5% of the true asymptotic standard deviation.

In Figure 8 we again display a histogram of  $N = 10\,000$  independent quasi-maximum likelihood estimators  $\hat{\delta}^{(i)}(T)$  for  $T = 200\,000$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  in the case of an isolated estimation




Figure 6: Ten sequences of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators for the parameter  $\delta^* = 3$ . On the left  $m$  is assumed to be unobservable, while it is observed on the right.






Figure 7: The upper three rows contain ten sequences of estimator standard deviations, respectively obtained from the estimates  $\hat{V}_t[\hat{\theta}(t)]$  for  $t$  between 1 and  $100 \cdot 10^6$ . The left column displays the standard deviation for an isolated estimation of the parameter components, while the right shows the same if the whole parameter  $\vartheta$  is estimated. The last row contains ten sequences of asymptotic estimator correlations obtained from  $\hat{V}_t[\hat{\theta}(t)]$ . Black lines show values obtained from the explicit calculations detailed in Section 3.3.

of  $\delta$  with the latent mean  $m$  treated as unobservable. Next to a kernel density estimate, we again show the Gaussian density corresponding to a mean of  $\delta^* = 3$  and a standard deviation of  $\frac{\text{Std}^*[\hat{\delta}]}{\sqrt{200\,000}}$ , where the asymptotic estimator standard deviation  $\text{Std}^*[\hat{\delta}] : \approx 5.2054$  has been calculated explicitly using the methods from Section 3.3. As in the case of the Heston model, the computed standard deviation  $\frac{5.2054}{\sqrt{200\,000}}$  matches well with the standard deviation of the empirical distribution of the  $N$  estimators, which is approximately  $\frac{5.1953}{\sqrt{200\,000}}$ . A two-sided chi-square test does not reject the hypothesis  $\text{Var}(\hat{\delta}(200\,000)) = \frac{5.2054^2}{200\,000}$  at any reasonable level with a  $p$ -value of approximately 0.7890, which is again calculated as  $\min\{F(S), 1-F(S)\}$ , where  $S$  and  $F$  are the corresponding test statistic and the chi-square cumulative distribution function, respectively.




Figure 8: Histogram of  $N = 10\,000$  independent quasi-maximum likelihood estimators  $\hat{\delta}^{(i)}(T)$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , for  $\delta$  with  $T = 200\,000$ . On top we draw the Gaussian density corresponding to the normal distribution with mean  $\delta^* = 3$  and variance given by the explicit calculation of  $V_\theta$  in green, and we draw a kernel density estimate of the estimators  $\hat{\delta}^{(i)}(T)$  in red. The black dotted line indicates the true parameter value  $\delta^* = 3$ .

**Remark 4.9.** As in the case of the Heston model, the asymptotic accuracy of the estimation depends on the chosen step size  $\Delta t$ . Choosing  $\Delta t = \frac{1}{24000}$  corresponds again approximately to a five-minute increment if time is measured in years. In this case the asymptotic standard deviation for estimating  $\delta$  becomes  $\text{Std}^*[\hat{\delta}] \approx 464.7759$ . As for the Heston model, a higher accuracy can be achieved by incorporating higher powers of the components into the state space model.

## 5 Proofs

### 5.1 Proofs for Section 2

*Proof of Proposition 2.6.* This follows from Proposition 2.18 in Kallsen and Richert [73].  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.8.* For the Kálmán filter recursions see for example Kallsen and Richert [73, Proposition 3.1]. Equation (2.6) follows then from the fact that  $Y(t)$  is conditionally Gaussian given  $Y_o(1), \dots, Y_o(t-1)$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , with conditional mean given by the Kálmán filter mean and conditional covariance matrix given by the Kálmán filter covariance matrix. Since Assumption B warrants that  $C^\theta(t)$  are positive definite (see Proposition 2.13 below), the matrices  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  are positive definite for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , hence the inverse in (2.6) is well-defined.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.10.* As noted e.g. in [44, Example 6.30], the affine process  $(X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  is a  $p$ -polynomial process. By Example 2.5,  $(X, (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  is a polynomial state space model of order  $p$ . Hence,  $(\text{vec}_{\otimes p}(X), (\mathbb{P}_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta})$  is a polynomial state space model of order 1 and can be represented as  $\text{vec}_{\otimes p}(X(t)) = a_{\otimes p}^\theta + A_{\otimes p}^\theta \text{vec}_{\otimes p}(X(t-1)) + N_{\otimes p}^\theta(t)$  with some vector  $a_{\otimes p}^\theta$ , some matrix  $A_{\otimes p}^\theta$ , and a martingale difference  $N_{\otimes p}^\theta$ . By equation (2.2) and Corollary A.8, it suffices to

show that  $\rho(A_{\otimes p}^\theta) < 1$  for boundedness of  $p$ -th moments of  $X$ , which yields that  $X$  is bounded in  $L^p(\mathbb{P}_\theta)$  because  $p$  is even. Since it is notationally cumbersome, we will assume  $p = 2$ . The general case follows along the same lines. By [44, Theorem 6.6]

$$\varphi_t^\theta(u) := \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[ e^{iu^\top X(t+1)} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] = e^{\Psi_0^\theta(u) + \sum_{j=1}^d \Psi_j^\theta(u) X_j(t)} =: e^{\psi^\theta(u,t)}, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (5.1)$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and some complex-valued functions  $\Psi_j^\theta$ ,  $j \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ . Since  $\mathbb{E}_\theta[X(t+1) | \mathcal{F}_t] = -i \nabla_u \varphi_t^\theta(0)$ , the state transition matrix  $A^\theta$  of  $X$  is given by  $A_{ij}^\theta = -i \partial_{u_i} \Psi_j^\theta(0)$  for  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , which follows by differentiation in (5.1) and  $\varphi_t^\theta(0) = 1$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\theta [X_i(t+1)X_j(t+1) | \mathcal{F}_t] &= -\partial_{u_i} \partial_{u_j} \varphi_t^\theta(0) = -\partial_{u_i} \left[ (\partial_{u_j} \psi^\theta(u,t)) \varphi_t^\theta(u) \right] \Big|_{u=0} \\ &= -\partial_{u_i} \partial_{u_j} \psi^\theta(0,t) - (\partial_{u_i} \psi^\theta(0,t)) (\partial_{u_j} \psi^\theta(0,t)) \end{aligned}$$

for  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  which, up to an affine-linear function  $f(X(t))$ , is quadratic in  $X(t)$  with

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta [X_i(t+1)X_j(t+1) | \mathcal{F}_t] = \sum_{(n,m) \in \{1, \dots, d\}^2} -\partial_{u_i} \Psi_n^\theta(0) \partial_{u_j} \Psi_m^\theta(0) X_n(t) X_m(t) + f(X(t)).$$

The quadratic coefficients of the above function are precisely the entries of the matrix  $A^\theta \otimes A^\theta$ . It follows that the state transition matrix  $A_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  has the block triangular form

$$A_{\otimes 2}^\theta = \begin{pmatrix} A^\theta & 0 \\ \circ & A^\theta \otimes A^\theta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.2)$$

Since  $\rho(A^\theta) < 1$ , we have  $\rho(A^\theta \otimes A^\theta) < 1$  and hence  $\rho(A_{\otimes 2}^\theta) < 1$ , which proves that  $X$  is bounded in  $L^p(\mathbb{P}_\theta)$  for  $p = 2$ , as desired. The case  $p > 2$  can be handled completely analogously.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.12.* Existence and uniqueness of a stationary law for  $X$  and ergodicity of  $X$  follow immediately by Theorem A.1 because Assumption B.1 implies  $\psi$ -irreducibility and aperiodicity for  $\psi = \lambda_E$ . The final part of Theorem A.1 together with Assumption B.2 yields finiteness of moments of order  $4 + \delta$  or less under  $\mu_\theta$ . Moreover, Theorem A.1 states that for any polynomial  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of order 4 or less  $\mathbb{E}_\theta[g(X(t)) | X(0) = x] \rightarrow \int g d\mu_\theta$  for  $\lambda_E$ -almost all  $x \in E$ . It remains to verify that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta[g(X(t))] \rightarrow \int g d\mu_\theta$  at a geometric rate if  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a quadratic resp. quartic polynomial. From the above and (2.2), we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t) | X(0) = x) = (A^\theta)^t x + \left( \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (A^\theta)^s \right) a^\theta \quad (5.3)$$

converges to some constant independent of  $x$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $x \in D$ , where  $D$  is a dense subset of  $E$ . In particular,  $(A^\theta)^t(x - y) = \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t) | X(0) = x) - \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t) | X(0) = y) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $x, y \in D$ . By Lemma A.11 we can find  $\tilde{A}^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with  $\rho(\tilde{A}^\theta) < 1$  such that  $\tilde{A}^\theta(x - y) = A^\theta(x - y)$  for all  $x, y \in D$ . Since  $0 \in E$  and  $D$  is dense in  $E$ , we can first send  $y$  to 0 to deduce  $\tilde{A}^\theta x = A^\theta x$  on the dense subset  $D \subset E$ , which implies  $\tilde{A}^\theta x = A^\theta x$  for all  $x \in E$ . So without loss of generality, we can assume that  $A^\theta = \tilde{A}^\theta$  and hence  $\rho(A^\theta) < 1$ . This yields

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t)) = \int \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t) | X(0) = x) \mathbb{P}_\theta^{X(0)}(dx) = (A^\theta)^t \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0)) + \left( \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (A^\theta)^s \right) a^\theta \rightarrow \left( \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} (A^\theta)^s \right) a^\theta, \quad (5.4)$$

which proves the claim for first order polynomials. The parallel statement for quadratic resp. quartic polynomials follows from the same argument applied to  $A_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  resp.  $A_{\otimes 4}^\theta$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.13.* First note that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t))$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(X(t)))$  converge uniformly in  $\theta$  at a geometric rate to their respective limits from Proposition 2.12: Indeed, since  $a^\theta$  and  $A^\theta$  are continuous in  $\theta$  by Assumption A, Lemma A.7 shows that there are  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|(A^\theta)^t\| \leq c\gamma^t$ . Combined with the fact that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0))$  is bounded in  $\theta$ , we get that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t))$  converges uniformly at a geometric rate. The same holds for  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(X(t)))$  by applying the previous argument to  $a_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  and  $A_{\otimes 2}^\theta$ . Now, since  $C^\theta(t)$  contains by definition only first and second moments of  $X(t-1)$ , it also converges uniformly in  $\theta$  at a geometric rate to some limiting matrix  $C^\theta$  by Proposition 2.12. To show that the same holds also for the derivatives  $\partial_\theta^\alpha C^\theta(t)$  for any multi-index  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_3^k$ , it suffices to show that the derivatives of  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t))$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(X(t)))$  converge uniformly in  $\theta$  at a geometric rate. For  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t))$ , this follows quickly by differentiating (5.4) and applying Corollary A.9. The same holds for  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(X(t)))$  if one exchanges  $a^\theta$  and  $A^\theta$  by  $a_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  and  $A_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  in the previous argument.

It remains to show that  $C^\theta(t)$  and  $C^\theta = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} C^\theta(t)$  are positive definite. Since  $P_\theta(x, \cdot)$  is equivalent to  $\lambda_E$  for any  $x \in E$  and  $E$  is not contained in any proper subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\text{Cov}_\theta(X(t) | X(t-1) = x) = \text{Cov}_\theta(N(t) | X(t-1) = x)$  is positive definite for any  $x \in E$ . Now, because  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(N(t) | X(t-1)) = 0$  almost surely and

$$\text{Cov}_\theta(N(t)) = \mathbb{E}_\theta[\text{Cov}_\theta(N(t) | X(t-1))] + \text{Cov}_\theta[\mathbb{E}_\theta(N(t) | X(t-1))],$$

we have  $\text{Cov}_\theta(N(t)) = \int \text{Cov}_\theta(N(t) | X(t-1) = x) \mathbb{P}_\theta^{X(t-1)}(dx)$ , so  $\text{Cov}_\theta(N(t))$  is also positive definite. This result holds irrespective of the initial distribution of  $X(0)$ , so by choosing the invariant distribution  $X(0) \sim \mu_\theta$ , we obtain that  $C^\theta = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} C^\theta(t)$  is also positive definite.  $\square$

## 5.2 Proofs for Section 3.1

*Proof of Proposition 3.5.* For  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  the matrices  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t+1, t)$  and  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t)$  are positive definite because the matrices  $C^\theta(t)$  are positive definite (see Proposition 2.13) and hence all pseudoinverses occurring in Proposition 2.8 are proper inverses. The result now follows by differentiating the log-likelihood (2.6) with respect to  $\theta_j$ , using  $\partial_{\theta_j} M_\theta^{-1} = -M_\theta^{-1}(\partial_{\theta_j} M_\theta)M_\theta^{-1}$  as well as  $\partial_{\theta_j} \log \det M_\theta = \text{Tr}[M_\theta^{-1} \partial_{\theta_j} M_\theta]$  for a matrix-valued differentiable function  $\theta \mapsto M_\theta$  such that  $M_\theta$  is positive definite for all  $\theta$ , see Petersen and Pedersen [90] and the references therein.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.1.**  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta(Z^\vartheta(t)) = 0$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $Z^\vartheta(t)$  is quadratic in  $X_0$  and the second moments of  $X_0$  and  $Y_0$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$  match, we have  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta(Z^\vartheta(t)) = \mathbb{E}_\vartheta[\nabla_\theta \log q_t^\vartheta(Y_0(1), \dots, Y_0(t))] = \int \nabla_\theta q_t^\vartheta(y) dy$ . This vanishes if we can argue that  $\nabla_\theta \int q_t^\vartheta(y) dy = \int \nabla_\theta q_t^\vartheta(y) dy$ , which holds by dominated convergence if we find Lebesgue-integrable functions  $h_j$  with  $h_j(y) \geq |\partial_{\theta_j} q_t^\vartheta(y)|$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Now we have that  $\partial_{\theta_j} q_t^\vartheta(y) = (\partial_{\theta_j} \log q_t^\vartheta(y)) q_t^\vartheta(y)$ . The first factor on the right-hand side is quadratic in  $y_1, \dots, y_t$  with continuous coefficients in  $\theta$  while the second factor on the right hand side is a Gaussian density with continuous mean and covariance in  $\theta$ . Since  $\Theta$  is compact, all these coefficients and Gaussian densities are uniformly bounded in  $\theta$ , which finishes the proof.  $\square$

The proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 relies on two classic results from estimation theory:

**Proposition 5.2.** Assume that there is some continuous function  $Q : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\frac{1}{t} L^\theta(t) - Q(\theta)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$  and such that  $Q$  has a unique maximum at  $\vartheta$ . Then any sequence  $(\widehat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators is  $\vartheta$ -consistent.

*Proof.* Since  $\Theta$  is separable and both  $L^\theta(t)$  and  $Q(\theta)$  are continuous functions of  $\theta$ , it follows from Lemma A.19 that the uncountable supremum above is measurable and hence a well-defined random variable. Since convergence in probability is equivalent to the fact that each subsequence has a further subsequence converging almost surely, we see that any subsequence of  $(\hat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  has a further subsequence which converges  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -almost surely to  $\vartheta$  by Lemma A.13. Hence  $\hat{\theta}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} \vartheta$  for any such sequence  $(\hat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  of estimators.  $\square$

Under the conditions above, the existence of a  $\vartheta$ -consistent sequence of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators becomes very natural: since  $\frac{1}{t}L^\theta(t)$  converges to some continuous function  $Q$  in probability uniformly on  $\Theta$ , and since  $Q$  is uniquely maximised at  $\vartheta$ , the quasi-likelihood process  $L^\theta(t)$  must also have a maximum near  $\vartheta$  for sufficiently large  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *Suppose that  $\vartheta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$  and let the conditions of Proposition 5.2 hold with twice continuously differentiable  $Q$ . Set  $W := \nabla_\theta^2 Q$ . Assume that  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}Z^\vartheta(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta-d} Z$  for some  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued random variable  $Z$ , that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\frac{1}{t}\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) - W(\theta)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$ , and that  $W(\vartheta)$  is invertible. Then  $\sqrt{t}(\hat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta-d} -W(\vartheta)^{-1}Z$  for any  $\vartheta$ -consistent sequence  $(\hat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  of QML estimators.*

*Proof.* This follows as in Jacod and Sørensen [70, Theorem 2.11]. In particular, since  $\vartheta \in \text{int}(\Theta)$  and since  $\hat{\theta}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} \vartheta$ , we find that  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta(B_t) := \mathbb{P}_\vartheta(\hat{\theta}(t) \in \text{int}(\Theta)) \rightarrow 1$  and hence we have  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta(Z^\theta(t)|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}(t)} = 0) \rightarrow 1$ . Moreover, by the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 5.2, the uncountable supremum occurring in this proposition is measurable and hence a well-defined random variable. By the multivariate mean value theorem it follows that

$$Z^{\hat{\theta}(t)}(t) - Z^\vartheta(t) = \underbrace{\left( \int_0^1 \nabla_\theta Z^{\lambda\hat{\theta}(t) + (1-\lambda)\vartheta}(t) \, d\lambda \right)}_{=: \tilde{Z}^\vartheta(t)} (\hat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta).$$

Since the integrand above is continuous in  $\lambda$ ,  $\tilde{Z}^\vartheta(t)$  is measurable. Moreover, we can deduce  $\|\frac{1}{t}\tilde{Z}^\vartheta(t) - W(\vartheta)\| \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\frac{1}{t}\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) - W(\theta)\| + \sup \{\|W(\theta) - W(\vartheta)\| : \|\theta - \vartheta\| \leq \|\hat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta\|\}$ , which implies that  $\frac{1}{t}\tilde{Z}^\vartheta(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} W(\vartheta)$  because  $W$  is continuous and  $\hat{\theta}(t)$  is consistent. Defining the set  $C_t := \{\tilde{Z}^\vartheta(t) \text{ is invertible}\} \cap B_t$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta(C_t) \rightarrow 1$ . On the set  $C_t$  it holds that  $\sqrt{t}(\hat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta) = -t\tilde{Z}^\vartheta(t)^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}Z^\vartheta(t)$  and the right-hand side converges in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -law to  $-W(\vartheta)^{-1}Z$  by Slutsky's theorem. Since  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta(C_t) \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , this concludes.  $\square$

The main goal of Sections 5.2.1–5.2.3 is to establish the various conditions from Propositions 5.2 and 5.3 in order to prove Theorems 3.3 and 3.4. The following Section 5.2.1 is concerned with the condition  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}Z^\vartheta(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta-d} Z$  from Proposition 5.3. In Section 5.2.2 we deal with the uniform convergence  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\frac{1}{t}\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) - W(\theta)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$  from Proposition 5.3 before Section 5.2.3 fills in any missing details and finishes the proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4.

### 5.2.1 A functional central limit theorem for the quasi-score process

The general strategy to prove the condition from Proposition 5.3 is rather straightforward: Since  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}Z^\vartheta(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \sum_{s=1}^t Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)$ , the goal is to represent  $Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)$  as a function of a Markov chain and use a suitable central limit theorem for stationary Markov chains. The proof of this result will require several ergodicity properties of  $Z^\vartheta$ . Thus it will be necessary to use notions from the ergodic theory of discrete-time Markov chains. These details are confined to Appendix A.1, where we adapt our exposition to the classic book of Meyn and

Tweedie [85]. The difficulty of our approach lies in the fact that  $Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  is in general a function of all observations  $X_o(1), \dots, X_o(t-1)$  because the observed part  $X_o$  is typically not a Markov process. As in Section 3.2, we therefore introduce the  $E \times \mathbb{R}^{d(k+1)}$ -valued processes  $\bar{X}^\theta(t) := (X(t), \hat{X}^\theta(t, t-1), V^\theta(t, t-1))$ , which contain the polynomial state space model  $X$  augmented by the filtered component and by the first partial derivatives of the filtered component. The dynamics of  $\bar{X}^\theta$  under  $P_\theta$  can be written as

$$\bar{X}^\theta(t) = \begin{pmatrix} a^\theta \\ a^\theta \\ \partial_{\theta_1} a^\theta \\ \partial_{\theta_2} a^\theta \\ \vdots \\ \partial_{\theta_k} a^\theta \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} A^\theta & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ K^\theta(t-1)H & F^\theta(t-1) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \partial_{\theta_1} K^\theta(t-1)H & \partial_{\theta_1} F^\theta(t-1) & F^\theta(t-1) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \partial_{\theta_2} K^\theta(t-1)H & \partial_{\theta_2} F^\theta(t-1) & 0 & F^\theta(t-1) & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \partial_{\theta_k} K^\theta(t-1)H & \partial_{\theta_k} F^\theta(t-1) & 0 & 0 & \dots & F^\theta(t-1) \end{pmatrix} \bar{X}^\theta(t-1) + \begin{pmatrix} N^\theta(t) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.5)$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , where  $K^\theta(t) = A^\theta \hat{\Sigma}_{:,o}^\theta(t, t-1) \hat{\Sigma}_o^\theta(t, t-1)^{-1}$ , where  $F^\theta(t) := A^\theta - K^\theta(t)H$ , and  $H := (\delta_{m+i,j})_{i \in \{1, \dots, d-m\}, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}}$ , i.e.,  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{(d-m) \times d}$  is the matrix such that  $x_o = Hx$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Moreover,  $\bar{X}^\theta(0) = (X(0), E_\theta(X(0)), \nabla_\theta E_\theta(X(0)))$  holds almost surely under any measure  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ . The advantage of studying the process  $\bar{X}^\theta$  in place of  $X$  is that the conditional quasi-score  $Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  is a function just of  $\bar{X}^\theta(t)$  and not of any other past values as it is the case for  $X$ .

Note that  $\bar{X}^\theta$  is not a time-homogeneous Markov chain because its transition dynamics depend on time  $t$  through  $C^\theta(t)$ . A direct application of a suitable Markov chain central limit theorem to the quasi-score is hence out of reach. However, Lemma 3.7 in Section 3.2 establishes that the Kálmán filter covariance matrices  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and their derivatives  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$  converge as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  at a geometric rate. We show in Proposition 5.8 that this implies that  $\bar{X}^\theta$  can be asymptotically well-approximated by a time-homogeneous Markov chain because its transition dynamics become asymptotically independent of time.

**Remark 5.4.** In comparison to comparable literature for estimation of (partially-observed) VARMA models as Boubacar Maïnassara and Francq [26] or Schlemm and Stelzer [100], our approach of using Markovianity of an augmented version of the original process seems to be novel in the context of quasi-maximum likelihood estimation. The usual path to proving asymptotic normality of the quasi-score process consists in using certain strong mixing properties for the observed part of the process as well as results from spectral time series analysis, see for example the summability condition on the mixing coefficients cited in Schlemm and Stelzer [100]. Our conditions from Section 2.1 seem sufficient to prove such mixing properties by first establishing geometric ergodicity of  $X$  in a similar manner as in Proposition 5.22 and then using the well-known fact that geometric ergodicity implies an exponential mixing behaviour, see for example Liebscher [78, Proposition 4]. Nonetheless, we follow the different route described above because it enables us to derive closed-form expressions for asymptotic estimator covariances without resorting to the use of spectral analysis.

*Proof of Lemma 3.7.* For notational convenience we fix some  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and write  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t)$  for  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and  $S^\theta(t)$  for  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$ . From the Kálmán filter recursions it is apparent that  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t)$  obeys the discrete-time algebraic Riccati difference equation

$$\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t+1) = A^\theta \left[ \hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t) - \hat{\Sigma}_{:,o}^\theta(t) \hat{\Sigma}_o^\theta(t)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{:,o}^\theta(t)^\top \right] A^\theta + C^\theta(t+1) \quad (5.6)$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Indeed, since  $C^\theta(t)$  is positive definite by Proposition 2.13,  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t)$  and hence also  $\hat{\Sigma}_o^\theta(t)$  are positive definite for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , whence the inverse in (5.6) is well-defined. Since  $\rho(A^\theta) < 1$  by

Proposition 2.12, Anderson and Moore [7, pp. 78–82] show that there exists a unique positive definite fixed point  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta$  for (5.6) with  $C^\theta$  in place of  $C^\theta(t)$ . We proceed to show that  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t)$  in (5.6) converges to  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta$  at a geometric rate uniformly in  $\theta \in \Theta$ . First, we argue that the sequence  $(\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is bounded uniformly in  $\theta$ . Consider the auxiliary filter  $\widehat{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}}$  with

$$\widehat{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t, t-1) := a^\theta + A^\theta \widehat{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t-1, t-2).$$

Since the Kálmán filter  $\widehat{X}^\theta(t, t-1)$  is the optimal filter in the equivalent Gaussian state space model, Kallsen and Richert [73, Proposition 3.2] implies that

$$\text{Tr } \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t) = \mathbb{E}_\theta(\|X(t) - \widehat{X}^\theta(t, t-1)\|^2) \leq \mathbb{E}_\theta(\|X(t) - \widehat{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t, t-1)\|^2) = \text{Tr } \widehat{\Sigma}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t), \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\widehat{\Sigma}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t)$  denotes the auxiliary filter error covariance matrix. But  $\widehat{\Sigma}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t)$  obeys the discrete Lyapunov equation

$$\widehat{\Sigma}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t) = A^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t-1) A^{\theta \top} + C^\theta(t), \quad (5.8)$$

with  $\rho(A^\theta) < 1$ . Since  $C^\theta(t)$  converges to  $C^\theta$  uniformly, it is bounded uniformly in  $\theta$ , so Lemma A.10(1) shows that the sequence  $(\widehat{\Sigma}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is bounded uniformly in  $\theta$ . A fortiori, the sequence  $(\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is also bounded uniformly in  $\theta$  by (5.7). Now, a simple calculation shows that the Kálmán filter covariance matrix can be written in the Lyapunov form

$$\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t+1) = (A^\theta - K^\theta(t)H) \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t) (A^\theta - K^\theta(t)H)^\top + C^\theta(t+1) \quad (5.9)$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , where  $K^\theta(t) = A^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}_{:,o}^{\theta}(t) (\widehat{\Sigma}_o^\theta(t))^{-1}$ . Define  $\Psi_{t,s}^\theta := (A^\theta - K^\theta(t-1)H) \cdots (A^\theta - K^\theta(s)H)$  and fix  $s \in \{1, \dots, t-1\}$ . Since  $C^\theta(u)$  is positive definite for any  $u \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , it follows that

$$\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t) = \Psi_{t,s}^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(s) \Psi_{t,s}^{\theta \top} + \text{positive definite terms} \geq \Psi_{t,s}^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(s) \Psi_{t,s}^{\theta \top},$$

and hence the matrices on the right-hand side are bounded uniformly in  $\theta$ . By the Courant-Fischer theorem, the  $j$ -th diagonal element of the matrix on the right hand side is bounded from below by  $\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(s)) \|(\Psi_{t,s}^\theta)_j\|^2$ , where  $(\Psi_{t,s}^\theta)_j$  denotes the  $j$ -th row of  $\Psi_{t,s}^\theta$  and  $\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(s))$  the smallest eigenvalue of  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(s)$ . Since  $\Theta$  is compact and  $\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(s))$  is continuous in  $\theta$  and positive for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ , it is uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant  $\lambda$ . Hence  $\lambda \|(\Psi_{t,s}^\theta)_j\|^2$  is uniformly bounded in  $\theta$  and  $t$ . In particular, the matrices  $\Psi_{t,s}^\theta$  are bounded uniformly in  $\theta$ ,  $t$ , and  $s < t$ . Following a lengthy calculation, one can now show that

$$\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t) - \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta = (A^\theta - K^\theta H) (\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t-1) - \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta) (A^\theta - K^\theta(t-1)H)^\top + D^\theta(t),$$

where  $K^\theta := A^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}_{:,o}^\theta (\widehat{\Sigma}_o^\theta)^{-1}$  is the limiting Kálmán gain and  $D^\theta(t) := C^\theta(t) - C^\theta$ , see Anderson and Moore [7, Problem 4.5]. By iterating this equation one obtains

$$\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t) - \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta = (A^\theta - K^\theta H)^{t-1} (\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(1) - \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta) \Psi_{t,1}^{\theta \top} + \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} (A^\theta - K^\theta H)^s D^\theta(t-s) \Psi_{t,t-s}^{\theta \top}. \quad (5.10)$$

Let  $F^\theta := A^\theta - K^\theta H$ . We now argue that  $\rho(F^\theta) \leq \alpha$  for any  $\theta \in \Theta$  and some  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ . Analogously to equation (5.9),  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta$  is a fixed point of the matrix-valued Lyapunov equation

$$\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta = F^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta F^{\theta \top} + C^\theta. \quad (5.11)$$

Suppose now that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists some  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that  $F^{\theta^\top}$  has some eigenvalue  $\lambda_\theta$  with  $|\lambda_\theta|^2 > 1 - \varepsilon$ , and let  $v_\theta \neq 0$  denote a corresponding complex eigenvector. It follows

$$(1 - |\lambda_\theta|^2) \overline{v_\theta} \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta v_\theta = \overline{v_\theta} C^\theta v_\theta, \quad (5.12)$$

where the bar denotes the complex conjugate transpose. If  $|\lambda_\theta| \geq 1$ , the left-hand side is non-positive while the right-hand side is positive by the positive definiteness of  $C^\theta$ , which yields a contradiction. Hence  $|\lambda_\theta| < 1$ . Since  $C^\theta$  is positive definite for any  $\theta$  by Proposition 2.13, the right-hand side of (5.12) is bounded from below by  $\lambda_{\min}(C^\theta) |v_\theta|^2$ . As  $C^\theta(t)$  is a sequence of continuous functions converging uniformly to  $C^\theta$ ,  $C^\theta$  is continuous in  $\theta$  as well. It follows that also  $\lambda_{\min}(C^\theta)$  is continuous in  $\theta$  and hence uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant  $\eta$  because  $\Theta$  is compact. In a similar manner, the left-hand side of (5.12) is bounded from above by  $\varepsilon \rho(\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta) |v_\theta|^2$ . By cancelling  $|v_\theta|^2$  we obtain all in all that

$$\varepsilon \rho(\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta) \geq \eta.$$

But this is impossible because  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary and  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta$  is bounded in  $\theta$  as the pointwise limit of the uniformly bounded sequence  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t)$ . So  $\rho(F^\theta) \leq \alpha < 1$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  and some  $\alpha < 1$ . Finally,  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta \geq C^\theta$  by (5.11) in the Loewner order. Since the eigenvalues of  $C^\theta$  are uniformly bounded from below on  $\Theta$  by some positive  $\eta$  as before, the eigenvalues and hence the determinant of  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta$  is uniformly bounded from below on  $\Theta$  by some positive constant. By Lemma A.5 this shows that  $(\widehat{\Sigma}_o^\theta)^{-1}$  and hence also  $F^\theta$  is bounded in  $\theta$ . Lemma A.6 thus yields that there are  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\|(F^\theta)^t\| \leq c\gamma^t$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . For sufficiently large  $c$  and some  $\widehat{\gamma} \in (\gamma, 1)$  we also have  $\|D^\theta(t)\| \leq c\widehat{\gamma}^t$  for all  $\theta$  and some  $p \geq 0$ , see Proposition 2.13. By (5.10) we obtain for all  $\theta \in \Theta$

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t) - \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta\| \leq c\gamma^{t-1} \|\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(1) - \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta\| \|\Psi_{t,1}^{\theta^\top}\| + c^2 \widehat{\gamma}^t \sum_{s=0}^{t-2} \left(\frac{\gamma}{\widehat{\gamma}}\right)^s \|\Psi_{t,t-s}^{\theta^\top}\|.$$

Since the norms  $\|\Psi_{t,t-s}^{\theta^\top}\|$  and  $\|\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(1) - \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta\|$  are bounded uniformly in  $\theta$ , this proves  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t) \rightarrow \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta$  uniformly at a geometric rate. As products of uniformly convergent and uniformly bounded sequences are uniformly convergent, Lemma A.15.1–3 show that the same holds also for the sequence of matrices  $A^\theta - K^\theta(t)H$  as well as  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t)$ . In particular, the matrix  $F^\theta = A^\theta - K^\theta H$  is continuous on  $\Theta$  because it is the uniform limit of continuous functions. Let  $F^\theta(t) := A^\theta - K^\theta(t)H$ . To show the uniform geometric convergence of the matrices  $S^\theta(t)$ , note that algebraic manipulations of the recursive equations from Proposition 3.5 yield

$$S^\theta(t) = F^\theta(t-1)S^\theta(t-1)F^\theta(t-1)^\top + A^\theta \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t-1, t-1) (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta)^\top + (\partial_{\theta_j} A^\theta) \widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t-1, t-1) A^{\theta^\top} + \partial_{\theta_j}(C^\theta(t)).$$

Since  $A^\theta$  and its partial derivatives are bounded as continuous functions on a compact domain, the the last three summands on the right converge uniformly at a geometric rate. Thus, Lemma A.10.3 implies that  $S^\theta(t)$  converges uniformly at a geometric rate, as desired. The matrices  $R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$  can be treated completely analogously.  $\square$

As in Section 3.3, Lemma 3.7 suggests that we can approximate the process  $\overline{X}^\theta$  by the time-homogeneous Markov chain  $\overline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}} = (X, \widehat{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}, V^{\theta, \text{hom}})$  that is defined by transition dynamics identical to  $\overline{X}^\theta$  but with the limiting matrices  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta$  and  $S_j^\theta$  in place of  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$ , respectively, for  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Then we obtain the following



**Corollary 5.5.** *Let  $\bar{a}^\theta$  denote the state transition vector and  $\bar{A}^\theta(t)$  the (time-dependent) state transition matrix of  $\bar{X}^\theta$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ . Additionally, let  $\bar{N}^\theta$  denote the  $d(k+2)$ -dimensional martingale difference sequence for  $\bar{X}^\theta$  from (5.5). Then there exists a matrix  $\bar{A}^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d(k+2) \times d(k+2)}$  with  $\rho(\bar{A}^\theta) < 1$  such that  $\bar{A}^\theta(t) \rightarrow \bar{A}^\theta$  uniformly in  $\theta$  at a geometric rate. Moreover, the homogeneous Markov chain  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  with  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(0) := \bar{X}^\theta(0)$  and  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) := \hat{a}_1^\theta + \bar{A}^\theta \bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t-1) + \bar{N}^\theta(t)$  is a polynomial state space model of order 2 resp., under the stronger Assumption A', of order 4.*

*Proof.* The uniform convergence  $\bar{A}^\theta(t) \rightarrow \bar{A}^\theta$  at a geometric rate follows from Lemma 3.7 because all submatrices present in  $\bar{A}^\theta(t+1)$  are products of constant matrices and the matrices  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t)$  as well as  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$  and  $S_j^\theta(t, t)$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Moreover,  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  has bounded  $(4 + \delta)$ th moments by Lemma A.14 because  $X$  does. Since  $\bar{N}^\theta$  contains only  $N^\theta$  and zero components, it follows then that conditional expectations of quadratic (resp. quartic) polynomials in the components of  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t)$  given  $\mathcal{F}_s$  are quadratic (resp. quartic) in the components of  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(s)$ , that is  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  is a polynomial state space model of order 2 (resp. 4) and bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$ . Finally, we have  $\rho(\bar{A}^\theta) < 1$  because  $\bar{A}^\theta$  is a block upper-triangular matrix whose matrices on the diagonal are  $A^\theta$  and  $F^\theta$ , where  $F^\theta = A^\theta - K^\theta H$  with  $K^\theta = A^\theta \hat{\Sigma}_{:,o}^\theta (\hat{\Sigma}_o^\theta)^{-1}$ . Here,  $\rho(A^\theta) < 1$  by Proposition 2.12 and  $\rho(F^\theta) < 1$  by the proof of Lemma 3.7.  $\square$

In order to obtain stochastic stability properties for the inhomogeneous process  $\bar{X}^\theta$ , we are now ready to establish a weak form of ergodicity for the homogeneous counterpart  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ .

**Proposition 5.6.** *For any  $\theta \in \Theta$  there is a unique invariant probability measure  $\bar{\mu}_\theta$  for  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  such that  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  is weakly  $f$ -ergodic with respect to  $\bar{\mu}_\theta$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$  for any polynomial  $f : E \times \mathbb{R}^{d(k+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of degree 4 or less. Moreover,  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta(f(\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t))) \rightarrow \int f d\bar{\mu}_\theta$  at a geometric rate if  $f$  is quadratic (quartic if Assumption A' holds). Finally, the process  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}(\mathbb{P}_\vartheta)$ .*

*Proof.* The state transition matrix  $\bar{A}^\theta$  of  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$  has the block lower-triangular form

$$\bar{A}^\theta = \begin{pmatrix} A^\theta & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ G^\theta & F^\theta & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \circ & \circ & \text{diag}_k(F^\theta) & \dots & \circ \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \circ & \circ & \circ & \dots & F^\theta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A^\theta & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ G^\theta & F^\theta & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \circ & \circ & F^\theta & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \circ & \circ & \circ & \dots & F^\theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.13)$$

where  $\circ$  denotes an irrelevant matrix of suitable size,  $G^\theta = K^\theta H$  and  $F^\theta = A^\theta - K^\theta H$  as before. Since the proof of this result is surprisingly technical, we start by showing the claim for the process  $\tilde{X}^\theta := (X(t), \hat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t, t-1))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ . The same strategy of proof can then be extended to the whole  $d(k+2)$ -dimensional process  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  in the end. First,  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  is weakly Feller because the transition measures  $\tilde{P}_\theta(\cdot)$  of  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  are of the form  $\tilde{P}_\theta(\cdot) = P_\vartheta(x_{1:d}, \cdot) \otimes \varepsilon(G^\theta x_{1:d} + F^\theta x_{d+1:2d})$ , where  $\varepsilon(y)$  is the Dirac measure in  $y$ , as usual. In order to prove irreducibility and aperiodicity, we consider arbitrary deterministic starting points  $X(0) = x \in E$  and  $\hat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(0, -1) = \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , which is signified here by writing  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta,(x,\hat{x})}$  instead of  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$  as usual. Iterating the Kálmán filter recursion under the measure  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta,(x,\hat{x})}$  yields the closed-form expression

$$\hat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t, t-1) = (F^\theta)^t \hat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(0, -1) + \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (F^\theta)^s G^\theta X(t-s-1) + \left( \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (F^\theta)^s \right) a^\theta. \quad (5.14)$$

The process  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  itself is in general not irreducible, so a classic ergodicity proof for Markov chains cannot be applied to  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  directly. However, we are able to approximate  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  by irreducible

processes in a suitable manner. Let  $a_\infty^\theta := \left(\sum_{s=0}^\infty (F^\theta)^s\right)a^\theta$ , which exists and is finite because  $\rho(F^\theta) < 1$ , see the proof of 3.7. We now approximate  $\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  by the auxiliary processes

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{aux},a}(t) &:= (F^\theta)^t \widehat{x} + \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (F^\theta)^s G^\theta X(t-s-1) + a_\infty^\theta, \\ \widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}(t) &:= (F^\theta)^t \widehat{x} + \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (F^\theta)^s G^\theta X(t-s-1),\end{aligned}$$

and let  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux},a} := (X, \widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{aux},a})$  and  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}} := (X, \widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}})$ . We proceed to prove irreducibility of  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}$  and  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux},a}$  if the state space is suitably restricted to some subset of  $E \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . For any matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  we define  $M(E)$  to be the image of  $E$  under the linear map defined by  $M$ , and we let  $\oplus$  denote the usual Minkowski sum of subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Define the set

$$\mathcal{R}^\theta := \bigoplus_{s=0}^\infty (F^\theta)^s G^\theta(E) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \quad (5.15)$$

and let  $\mathcal{R}_a^\theta := \mathcal{R}^\theta + a^\theta$ . Since  $E$  is a connected smooth manifold containing 0,  $\mathcal{R}^\theta \ni 0$  is a connected smooth manifold too, and the partial sums in (5.15) form an increasing sequence of sets. Suppose that the state space for  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}$  is restricted from  $E \times \mathbb{R}^d$  to  $E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta$  so that  $\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}(0) \in \mathcal{R}^\theta$ , where we equip  $E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta$  with the induced topology. This restriction makes sense because as long as  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}(0) \in E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta$ , we also have  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}(t) \in E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta$  and so, in the language of Meyn and Tweedie [85],  $E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta$  is an absorbing set for the Markov chain  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}$ . Let  $j \leq d$  be the topological covering dimension of  $\mathcal{R}^\theta$  and let  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  denote the smallest integer such that

$$\mathcal{J}^\theta := G^\theta(E) \oplus F^\theta G^\theta(E) \oplus \dots \oplus (F^\theta)^l G^\theta(E) \subseteq \mathcal{R}^\theta \quad (5.16)$$

has topological covering dimension  $j$ . In particular, by the topological properties of smooth manifolds, any topological covering dimension considered here coincides with the Hausdorff dimension of the corresponding set under consideration. Let  $\lambda_{\mathcal{R}^\theta}$  denote the  $j$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure on  $\mathcal{R}^\theta$ , as usual. Then we can find some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and some open  $H \subseteq \text{int}(\mathcal{J}^\theta)$  such that  $\lambda_{\mathcal{R}^\theta}(H) > 0$  and such that any  $x \in \mathcal{R}^\theta$  with  $\|x - H\| < \varepsilon$  is still an element of  $\mathcal{J}^\theta$ . Here, the interior is to be understood in the induced topology on  $\mathcal{R}^\theta$ . As  $\rho(F^\theta) < 1$ , we can find  $t > l + 1$  such that  $\|(F^\theta)^{t-1} G^\theta x\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  as well as  $\|(F^\theta)^t \widehat{x}\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  for any  $(x, \widehat{x}) \in E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta$  by Corollary A.8. Since  $(X(1), \dots, X(t-1))$  has a positive density with respect to the proper Hausdorff measure  $\lambda_{E^{t-1}}$  on  $E^{t-1}$  by Assumption B.1, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta,(x,\widehat{x})}(\widehat{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}(t) \in H) = \mathbb{P}_{\vartheta,(x,\widehat{x})}((F^\theta)^{t-1} G^\theta x + (F^\theta)^t \widehat{x} + \zeta \in H) = \mathbb{P}_{\vartheta,(x,\widehat{x})}(\zeta \in H - (F^\theta)^{t-1} G^\theta x - (F^\theta)^t \widehat{x}),$$

where  $\zeta$  is a random variable with a positive density with respect to  $j$ -dimensional proper Hausdorff measure on  $G^\theta(E) \oplus F^\theta G^\theta(E) \oplus \dots \oplus (F^\theta)^{t-2} G^\theta(E)$ . Since  $\mathcal{J}^\theta$  has the same dimension as  $\mathcal{R}^\theta$ , since  $(F^\theta)^{t-1} G^\theta x + (F^\theta)^t \widehat{x} \in \mathcal{R}^\theta$ , and since  $\|(F^\theta)^{t-1} G^\theta x + (F^\theta)^t \widehat{x}\| < \varepsilon$ , it follows that  $H - (F^\theta)^{t-1} G^\theta x - (F^\theta)^t \widehat{x} \subseteq \mathcal{J}^\theta \subseteq G^\theta(E) \oplus F^\theta G^\theta(E) \oplus (F^\theta)^{t-2} G^\theta(E)$ , and so we obtain that  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta,(x,\widehat{x})}(\zeta \in H - (F^\theta)^{t-1} G^\theta x - (F^\theta)^t \widehat{x}) > 0$ . As we can repeat this construction for any subset of  $H$  with positive  $\lambda_{\mathcal{R}^\theta}$ -measure, this proves that  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}$  restricted to  $E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta$  is irreducible with respect to  $\varphi := \lambda_E \otimes \lambda_H$ , where  $\lambda_H$  is the restriction of  $\lambda_{\mathcal{R}^\theta}$  to  $H$ . By  $\psi$  we denote a corresponding maximal irreducibility measure for  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}}$ . It follows that the shifted process  $\widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux},a} = \widetilde{X}^{\theta,\text{aux}} + a_\infty^\theta$  is irreducible as well if the state space is restricted to  $E \times \mathcal{R}_a^\theta$ .

In a next step we show that  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}}$  restricted to  $E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta$  is aperiodic. Suppose there exists a  $k$ -cycle for  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}}$  with  $k \geq 2$ , i.e. disjoint  $D_1, \dots, D_k \in \mathcal{B}(E \times \mathcal{R}^\theta)$  with  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta, (x, \hat{x})}(\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}}(1) \in D_{i+1}) = 1$  for all  $(x, \hat{x}) \in D_i$  and  $i = 0, \dots, k-1 \pmod{k}$  and  $\psi\left[\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k D_i\right)^c\right] = 0$ . Since  $X$  is aperiodic, the (up to  $\psi$ -null sets) only possible choices for  $D_i$  are of the form  $D_i = E \times D'_i$  for some  $D'_i \subseteq \mathcal{R}^\theta$ , where  $D'_2 = F^\theta(D'_1) \oplus G^\theta(E)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $D'_k = (F^\theta)^{k-1}(D'_1) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=0}^{k-2} (F^\theta)^i G^\theta(E)$ . Then

$$D'_1 = (F^\theta)^{nk}(D'_1) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=0}^{nk-1} (F^\theta)^i G^\theta(E) \quad \text{and} \quad D'_2 = (F^\theta)^{nk+1}(D'_1) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=0}^{nk} (F^\theta)^i G^\theta(E)$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Fix any  $z \in D'_1$ . It follows that  $(F^\theta)^{nk}z + \mathcal{J}^\theta \subseteq D'_1$  and  $(F^\theta)^{nk+1}z + \mathcal{J}^\theta \subseteq D'_2$ , where  $\mathcal{J}^\theta$  is given in (5.16). Choose  $n$  large enough so that  $\|(F^\theta)^{nk}z\| < \varepsilon$  and  $\|(F^\theta)^{nk+1}z\| < \varepsilon$ , which is possible because  $\rho(F^\theta) < 1$ . Since the set  $H \subseteq \mathcal{J}^\theta$  is chosen in such a way that any  $x \in \mathcal{R}^\theta$  with  $\|x - H\| < \varepsilon$  is still an element of  $\mathcal{J}^\theta$ , we obtain  $H \subseteq D'_1$  and  $H \subseteq D'_2$ . But  $\psi(H) > 0$ , which is a contradiction to the disjointness of the sets  $D'_1$  and  $D'_2$  up to  $\psi$ -null sets. It follows that the process  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}}$  is aperiodic and hence also the shifted process  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}$ .

The next step of the proof consists in showing that  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}$  has uniformly bounded moments of order  $4 + \delta$ . Since  $\|a + b\|^p \leq 2^{p-1}(\|a\|^p + \|b\|^p)$  for  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , one obtains that

$$\mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \|\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}(t)\|^p \right] \leq 2^{p-1} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \|X(t)\|^p \right] + 2^{p-1} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \|\hat{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}(t)\|^p \right]$$

for any  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . Since  $X$  has uniformly bounded moments of order  $4 + \delta$ , the claim follows by establishing that  $\hat{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}$  has uniformly bounded moments of order  $4 + \delta$ . This however holds by Lemma A.14. By the same argument, the processes  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  and  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  are also bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$ .

Since  $\text{supp}(\psi) \supseteq H$  has non-empty interior, all conditions from Theorem A.1 are fulfilled for  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}$  restricted to the space  $E \times \mathcal{R}_a^\theta$ . It follows that  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}$  restricted to  $E \times \mathcal{R}_a^\theta$  is strongly ergodic under  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ , i.e. there exists a unique invariant probability measure  $\tilde{\mu}_\theta$  on  $E \times \mathcal{R}_a^\theta$  for  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta^{\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}(t)} \xrightarrow{w} \tilde{\mu}_\theta$  as well as  $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}(s)) \rightarrow \int f \, d\tilde{\mu}_\theta$   $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -almost surely as long as  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{R}^\theta$ , and that moreover  $\mathbb{E}_{\vartheta, (x, \hat{x})} [f(\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}(t))] \rightarrow \int f \, d\tilde{\mu}_\theta$  for  $\lambda_E$ -almost all  $x \in E$  and all  $\tilde{\mu}_\theta$ -integrable functions  $f$ . Since  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}$  has uniformly bounded moments of order  $4 + \delta$ , the final part of Theorem A.1 yields that  $\tilde{\mu}_\theta$  has finite moments of order  $4 + \delta$ . The transition dynamics of  $\hat{X}_\theta^{\text{aux}, a}$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}_\theta^{\text{aux}, a}(t) &= G^\theta X(t-1) + F^\theta(\hat{X}_\theta^{\text{aux}, a}(t-1) - a_\infty^\theta) + a_\infty^\theta \\ &= G^\theta X(t-1) + F^\theta \hat{X}_\theta^{\text{aux}, a}(t-1) + (\text{Id} - F^\theta)a_\infty^\theta \\ &= G^\theta X(t-1) + F^\theta \hat{X}_\theta^{\text{aux}, a}(t-1) + a^\theta \end{aligned}$$

because  $a_\infty^\theta = (\text{Id} - F^\theta)^{-1}a^\theta$ . Hence  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}$  has the same transition dynamics as  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  and so  $\tilde{\mu}_\theta$  is also a unique invariant probability measure for  $\tilde{X}^\theta$ . Finally, we enlarge the state space from  $E \times \mathcal{R}_a^\theta$  back to  $E \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and consider again the original  $E \times \mathbb{R}^d$ -valued process  $\tilde{X}^\theta$ . In line with the above, we consider initial distributions  $\tilde{X}^\theta(0) \sim \nu_\vartheta \otimes \varepsilon(\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0)))$  for arbitrary distributions  $\nu_\vartheta$  on  $E$  and  $\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}(0) \sim \nu_\vartheta \otimes \varepsilon(\hat{x} + a_\infty^\theta)$  for  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{R}^\theta$ , signified by the notation  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta, (\nu_\vartheta, \hat{x})}$ . Then  $\|\tilde{X}^\theta(t) - \tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}(t)\|$  forms a deterministic sequence converging to 0 under any  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta, (\nu_\vartheta, \hat{x})}$ . Since  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$ , it follows that  $f(\tilde{X}^\theta(t)) - f(\tilde{X}^{\theta, \text{aux}, a}(t)) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^1$  under any  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta, (\nu_\vartheta, \hat{x})}$  and for any polynomial  $f$  of order 4 or less by Lemma A.17. This finally yields for any such polynomial  $f$  that  $\mathbb{E}_{\vartheta, (x, \hat{x})} [f(\tilde{X}^\theta(t))] \rightarrow \int f \, d\tilde{\mu}_\theta$  for  $\lambda_E$ -almost any  $x \in E$  and any  $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{R}^d$  as

well as  $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\tilde{X}^\theta(s)) \xrightarrow{L^1} \int f d\tilde{\mu}_\theta$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ . In particular, we have shown that  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  is weakly  $f$ -ergodic with respect to  $\tilde{\mu}_\theta$  for any such function  $f$ . The final part of the theorem for  $\tilde{X}^\theta$ , i.e. the fact that convergence of expectations of quadratic (quartic) polynomials holds even for any starting distribution and at a geometric rate, follows then by the exact same argument as in the proof of Proposition 2.12 because  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  is a polynomial state space model of order 2 (resp. 4) whenever  $X$  is a polynomial state space model of order 2 (resp. 4).

The treatment of the  $d(k+2)$ -dimensional process  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  is completely analogous. This can be seen by setting  $Y^{\theta,\text{hom}} := (\hat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}, V^{\theta,\text{hom}})^\top$ . From (5.13), the dynamics of  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  are

$$\begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ Y^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \bar{a}^\theta + \begin{pmatrix} A^\theta & 0 \\ \bar{G}^\theta & \bar{F}^\theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X(t-1) \\ Y^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t-1) \end{pmatrix} + \bar{N}^\theta(t)$$

with some matrices  $\bar{G}^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d(k+1) \times d}$  and  $\bar{F}^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d(k+1) \times d(k+1)}$  satisfying  $\rho(\bar{F}^\theta) < 1$  because  $\rho(F^\theta) < 1$  and  $\bar{F}^\theta$  is a block-lower triangular matrix whose submatrices on the main diagonal are  $F^\theta$ , see (5.13). Hence  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  has exactly the same structure as  $\tilde{X}^\theta$  when  $\hat{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  is replaced by  $Y^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ , and the same proof as above can be applied to  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ .  $\square$

The preceding results from Lemma 3.7, Corollary 5.5, and Proposition 5.6 are intuitive and constitute to some extent well-known facts in the filtering and engineering literature subsumed under the name of a *steady-state Kálmán filter*, a term which dates over 50 years back to O'Donnel [89].

**Remark 5.7.** By exactly the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 2.12, we can choose the state transition matrix  $\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  in such a way that  $\rho(\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta) < 1$ , where  $\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  denotes the state transition matrix for the state space model  $\text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}})$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , see Remark 2.3.

**Proposition 5.8.**  $\bar{X}^\theta(t) - \bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0$  in  $L^{4+\delta}(\mathbb{P}_\theta)$  at a geometric rate.

*Proof.* As before let  $\bar{a}^\theta$  denote the state transition vector of  $\bar{X}^\theta$  and  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ , let  $\bar{A}^\theta(t)$  and  $\bar{A}^{\theta}$  denote the state transition matrices of  $\bar{X}^\theta$  and  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$ , respectively, and let  $\bar{N}^\theta$  denote the martingale difference sequence in the state space representation of  $\bar{X}^\theta$  and  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}$  (all under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ ). Then  $\bar{X}^\theta(t) = \bar{a}^\theta + \bar{A}^\theta(t)\bar{X}^\theta(t-1) + \bar{N}^\theta(t)$  and  $\bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) = \bar{a}^\theta + \bar{A}^\theta \bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t-1) + \bar{N}^\theta(t)$  as well as  $\bar{X}^\theta(0) = \bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(0)$ . Moreover  $\bar{A}^\theta(t) \rightarrow \bar{A}^\theta$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  at a geometric rate and  $\rho(\bar{A}^\theta) < 1$  by Corollary 5.5. By iterating and subtracting these equations, one obtains that

$$\bar{X}^\theta(t) - \bar{X}^{\theta,\text{hom}}(t) = \underbrace{\sum_{s=1}^t \left[ \prod_{r=s+1}^t \bar{A}^\theta(r) - (\bar{A}^\theta)^{t-s} \right] \bar{a}^\theta}_{(1)} + \underbrace{\sum_{s=1}^t \left[ \prod_{r=s+1}^t \bar{A}^\theta(r) - (\bar{A}^\theta)^{t-s} \right] \bar{N}^\theta(s)}_{(2)} + \underbrace{\left( \prod_{s=1}^t \bar{A}^\theta(s) - (\bar{A}^\theta)^t \right) \bar{X}^\theta(0)}_{(3)}$$

under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ . By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma A.10.3, the deterministic term (1) converges to 0 uniformly in  $\theta$  at a geometric rate and (3) converges to 0 in  $L^{4+\delta}$  at a geometric rate. So it only remains to focus on the term (2). By equation (A.8) there are a constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\left\| \prod_{r=s+1}^t \bar{A}^\theta(r) - (\bar{A}^\theta)^{t-s} \right\| \leq c\gamma^t$ . Hence

$$\|(2)\|_{L^{4+\delta}} \leq c\gamma^t \sum_{s=1}^t \|\bar{N}^\theta(s)\|_{L^{4+\delta}} \leq c\gamma^t$$

(with varying constants  $c, \gamma$  from one expression to the next) because  $\bar{N}^\theta$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$  as it consists only of  $N^\theta$  and zero components, and because  $N^\theta$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$  as  $X$  is

bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$ . It follows that (2)  $\xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0$  in  $L^{4+\delta}$  at a geometric rate and the same then also holds for  $\bar{X}^\theta(t) - \bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t)$ .  $\square$

Using the preceding Proposition 5.8, we can transfer the ergodicity results in Proposition 5.6 from the homogeneous Markov process  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  to the inhomogeneous process  $\bar{X}^\theta$ :

**Corollary 5.9.** *For any  $\theta \in \Theta$  the process  $\bar{X}^\theta$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}(\mathbb{P}_\theta)$  and weakly  $f$ -ergodic with respect to  $\bar{\mu}_\theta$  for any polynomial  $f : E \times \mathbb{R}^{d(k+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of degree 4 or less. In particular,  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{\bar{X}^\theta(t)} \xrightarrow{w} \bar{\mu}_\theta$  and  $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\bar{X}^\theta(s)) \rightarrow \int f d\bar{\mu}_\theta$  in  $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\theta)$ . Moreover  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(f(\bar{X}^\theta(t))) \rightarrow \int f d\bar{\mu}_\theta$  at a geometric rate if  $f$  is a quadratic polynomial (resp. quartic polynomial if Assumption A' holds).*

*Proof.* Boundedness in  $L^{4+\delta}$  follows from the preceding Proposition 5.8 because  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$  by Proposition 5.6. Since the law of  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t)$  converges weakly to  $\bar{\mu}_\theta$ , the law of  $\bar{X}^\theta(t)$  does so too by Slutsky's theorem. Finally, by Lemma A.17,  $f(\bar{X}^\theta(t)) - f(\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t)) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^1$ , so the convergence of arithmetic means and expectations follows from the respective convergence of  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  from Proposition 5.6. Likewise, since  $\bar{X}^\theta(t) - \bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^{4+\delta}$  converges even at a geometric rate, we obtain from Lemma A.17 that expectations of quartic functions of the process  $\bar{X}^\theta(t)$  converge at a geometric rate because the same holds for the process  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  by Proposition 5.6.  $\square$

In the following we let  $\bar{P}_\theta$  denote the one-step transition measures for the Markov chain  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  so that  $\bar{P}_\theta g(x) := \mathbb{E}_\theta[g(\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t)) \mid \bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t-1) = x]$ . The last ingredient on the way to a functional central limit theorem for the quasi-score process is the fact that every quadratic polynomial  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d(k+2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  gives rise to an explicitly solvable Poisson-type equation involving the operator  $\bar{P}_\theta$ . This is the content of the following lemma:

**Lemma 5.10.** *Every quadratic  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d(k+2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  can be represented as  $f(x) = \bar{P}_\theta g(x) - g(x) + r$  with some quadratic polynomial  $g : \mathbb{R}^{d(k+2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and some constant remainder  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is a quadratic polynomial, it can be written in the form  $f(x) = \alpha_f^\top \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x) + \beta_f$ , where  $\alpha_f \in \mathbb{R}^{d(k+2) + d^2(k+2)^2}$  is the vector of coefficients of the linear and quadratic terms of  $f$  and  $\beta_f \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose now that  $g$  is quadratic without a constant, i.e. of the form  $g(x) = \alpha_g^\top \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x)$ . Since  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  is a state space model of order 2, we have  $\bar{P}_\theta \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x) = \bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^\theta + \bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x)$ , where  $\bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  denotes the state transition vector for  $\text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}})$ . Hence

$$\bar{P}_\theta g(x) - g(x) = \alpha_g^\top \bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^\theta + \alpha_g^\top \bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x) - \alpha_g^\top \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x) = \alpha_g^\top \bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^\theta + \alpha_g^\top [\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta - \mathbf{I}] \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x),$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  denotes the  $d(k+2) + d^2(k+2)^2$ -dimensional identity matrix. Now set  $r := \beta_f - \alpha_g^\top \bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^\theta$ . Then the Poisson equation  $f(x) = \bar{P}_\theta g(x) - g(x) + r$  is fulfilled whenever  $\alpha_g^\top (\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta - \mathbf{I}) = \alpha_f^\top$ . This equation has the unique solution  $\alpha_g^\top = \alpha_f^\top (\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta - \mathbf{I})^{-1}$ , where the inverse is well-defined because  $\rho(\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta) < 1$  by Remark 5.7. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

The preceding lemma is the main ingredient of the following proof, which establishes the asymptotic normality condition for the quasi-score process from Proposition 5.3. The strategy of the proof consists of recognising that  $Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  is a quadratic polynomial in  $\bar{X}^\theta(t)$  with coefficients depending on  $t$ , which however converge as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  to some limiting coefficients. Hence we can approximate this polynomial by a time-invariant polynomial using the limiting coefficients, and we can moreover approximate  $\bar{X}^\theta$  by  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  in a suitable manner.

**Theorem 5.11.** *There is a positive semidefinite  $U_\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  with  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}Z^\vartheta(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta-d} Z \sim N(0, U_\vartheta)$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}Z^\vartheta(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\sum_{s=1}^t Z^\vartheta(s, s-1)$ , where each component  $Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$  is a quadratic polynomial with time-varying coefficients in  $\bar{X}^\vartheta(t)$  of the form

$$Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)_j = \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \alpha_{\lambda, j}^\vartheta(t) \bar{X}^\vartheta(t)^\lambda =: f_j^\vartheta(t, \bar{X}^\vartheta(t)),$$

the sum referring to  $d(k+2)$ -dimensional multi-indices  $\lambda$ . By the explicit representation in equation (3.1) the coefficients  $\alpha_{\lambda, j}^\vartheta(t)$  depend only on the matrices  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\vartheta(t, t-1)$  and  $S^{\vartheta, j}(t, t-1)$ , which by Lemma 3.7 converge as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  at a geometric rate. It follows quickly that there exist limiting coefficients  $\alpha_{\lambda, j}^\vartheta$  such that  $\alpha_{\lambda, j}^\vartheta(t) \rightarrow \alpha_{\lambda, j}^\vartheta$  at a geometric rate. Let  $f_j^\vartheta(y) := \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \alpha_{\lambda, j}^\vartheta y^\lambda$  denote the quadratic polynomial with these limiting coefficients, see equation (3.6). We use the following decomposition of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}Z^\vartheta(t)$ :

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}Z^\vartheta(t) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\sum_{s=1}^t f^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s))}_{(1)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\sum_{s=1}^t \left( \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \alpha_\lambda^\vartheta [\bar{X}^\vartheta(s)^\lambda - \bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)^\lambda] \right)}_{(2)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\sum_{s=1}^t \left( \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} [\alpha_\lambda^\vartheta(s) - \alpha_\lambda^\vartheta] \bar{X}^\vartheta(s)^\lambda \right)}_{(3)},$$

where  $f^\vartheta = (f_1^\vartheta, \dots, f_k^\vartheta)^\top$  and  $\alpha_\lambda^\vartheta = (\alpha_{\lambda, 1}^\vartheta, \dots, \alpha_{\lambda, k}^\vartheta)^\top$ . We show that (1) converges in distribution to a Gaussian random variable  $Z$ , while (2) and (3) converge in probability to 0. The result follows then from Slutsky's theorem. To treat (1), note that by Corollary 5.1 we have  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta[Z^\vartheta(t)] = \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\vartheta[Z^\vartheta(s, s-1)] = 0$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , so also  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta[Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)] = 0$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . By Corollary 5.9, this implies that

$$0 = \mathbb{E}_\vartheta[Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)] = \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \alpha_\lambda^\vartheta(t) \mathbb{E}_\vartheta[\bar{X}^\vartheta(t)^\lambda] \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \alpha_\lambda^\vartheta \int x^\lambda \bar{\mu}_\vartheta(dx) = \int f^\vartheta d\bar{\mu}_\vartheta,$$

so  $\int f^\vartheta d\bar{\mu}_\vartheta = 0$ . By applying Lemma 5.10 componentwise, there exists a  $k$ -dimensional quadratic polynomial  $g^\vartheta : \mathbb{R}^{d(k+2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  such that  $f^\vartheta = \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta - g^\vartheta + r^\vartheta$  for some constant  $r^\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . Since  $\bar{\mu}_\vartheta$  is an invariant probability measure for  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}$  and  $\bar{P}_\vartheta$  is the transition operator of  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}$ , it follows from the definition of an invariant probability measure that  $\int \bar{P}_\vartheta(g^\vartheta - g^\vartheta) d\bar{\mu}_\vartheta = 0$ . Hence we conveniently obtain  $r^\vartheta = 0$ . Now define the triangular array  $(U_t^\vartheta(s))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*, s \in \{1, \dots, t\}}$  of random variables by

$$U_t^\vartheta(s) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \left[ \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s-1)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)) \right].$$

Then  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta(U_t^\vartheta(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-1}) = 0$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $s \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ , so the process  $M^\vartheta$  with

$$M^\vartheta(t) := \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t} U_t^\vartheta(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \left[ g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(t)) + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t-1} f^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)) \right]$$

is a  $k$ -dimensional martingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ . Since  $g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(t))$  is bounded in  $L^1$ , it follows that  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}[g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(t))] \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^1$ . Hence it suffices to prove asymptotic normality of  $M^\vartheta$  in order to show asymptotic normality of (1). To do so, we establish the conditions of the martingale central limit theorem A.18. First, we show the addendum of

Theorem A.18, i.e. tightness of the sequence  $\widehat{V}^\vartheta(t) = \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\vartheta [\|U_t^\vartheta(s)\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-1}]$ . By definition of  $U_t^\vartheta$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\vartheta [\widehat{V}^\vartheta(t) > \lambda] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_\vartheta [\widehat{V}^\vartheta(t)]}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{\lambda t} \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \left\| \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s-1)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)) \right\|^2 \right].$$

The term inside the norm above is a  $k$ -dimensional quadratic polynomial in  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s-1)$  and  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)$ . So it is bounded in  $L^2$  by Lemma A.16. Hence,  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta [\widehat{V}^\vartheta(t) > \lambda] \rightarrow 0$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e. we obtain tightness of  $\widehat{V}^\vartheta$ . Theorem A.18 hence tells us that the asymptotic covariance matrix of (1) is given by  $U_\vartheta := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{s=1}^t U_t^\vartheta(s) U_t^{\vartheta \top}(s)$ , where the limit is in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability if it exists. We have

$$\sum_{s=1}^t U_t^\vartheta(s) U_t^{\vartheta \top}(s) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \left[ \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s-1)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)) \right] \left[ \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s-1)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)) \right]^\top,$$

where each summand is an  $\mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ -valued random variable whose entries are quartic polynomials in  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s-1)$  and  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)$ . Since  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}$  is weakly  $f$ -ergodic for any quartic polynomial  $f$  by Proposition 5.6, it is clear that the same holds also true for  $(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(t), \bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(t-1))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ . Thus the limit  $U_\vartheta$  in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability is indeed well-defined and exists. It remains to prove the Lindeberg condition 2. from the martingale central limit theorem A.18 to show asymptotic normality of (1). Since  $[\bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s-1)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s))]$  is a  $k$ -dimensional quadratic polynomial in  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s-1)$  and  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s)$ , it is bounded in  $L^{2+\frac{\delta}{2}}$  because  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$  by Lemma A.16. Hence there exists some  $B \geq 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta [\|U_t^\vartheta(s)\|^{2+\eta}] \leq Bt^{-(1+\frac{\eta}{2})}$  for all  $s \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ , where  $\eta := \frac{\delta}{2}$ . Moreover,  $\|U_t^\vartheta(s)\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\|U_t^\vartheta(s)\| > \varepsilon\}} \leq \varepsilon^{-\eta} \|U_t^\vartheta(s)\|^{2+\eta}$ , so

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \|U_t^\vartheta(s)\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\|U_t^\vartheta(s)\| > \varepsilon\}} \right] \leq \varepsilon^{-\eta} \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \|U_t^\vartheta(s)\|^{2+\eta} \right] \leq B\varepsilon^{-\eta} t^{-\frac{\eta}{2}} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

This establishes that (1)  $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta-d} Z \sim N(0, U_\vartheta)$ . To show that (2) converges in probability to 0, note that  $\sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \alpha_\lambda^\vartheta [\bar{X}^\vartheta(t)^\lambda - \bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(t)^\lambda] = f^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(t)) - f^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(t))$  converges in  $L^1$  to 0 at a geometric rate by Proposition 5.8 and Lemma A.17, so  $\sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\vartheta [\|f^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s)) - f^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(s))\|]$  converges as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and thus (2)  $\rightarrow 0$  in  $L^1$ . Finally, we prove that (3) converges to 0 in  $L^1$ . Since all absolute first and second powers of  $\bar{X}^\vartheta$  are bounded in expectation by some constant  $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$  (see Corollary 5.9), one has

$$\|(3)\|_{L^1} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}} \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \|\alpha_\lambda^\vartheta(s) - \alpha_\lambda^\vartheta\|.$$

But  $\alpha_\lambda^\vartheta(t) \rightarrow \alpha_\lambda^\vartheta$  at a geometric rate, so the sum  $\sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \|\alpha_\lambda^\vartheta(s) - \alpha_\lambda^\vartheta\|$  converges and therefore (3) converges to 0 as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  in  $L^1$ , finishing the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.12.** *Let  $g^\vartheta$  be the solution to the Poisson equation  $f^\vartheta = \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta - g^\vartheta$ , where  $f^\vartheta$  is as in equation (3.6). Then the limiting covariance matrix  $U_\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  from Theorem 5.11 is given by*

$$U_\vartheta = \mathbb{P}_\vartheta\text{-}\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \left[ g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s)) g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s))^\top - \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s)) \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s))^\top \right]. \quad (5.17)$$

Additionally, if Assumption A' holds, the matrix  $U_\vartheta$  can be expressed as

$$U_\vartheta = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(t)) g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(t))^\top - \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(t)) \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(t))^\top \right]. \quad (5.18)$$

*Proof.* By the reasoning from the proof of Theorem 5.11, the given Poisson equation has a solution  $g^\vartheta$  within the  $k$ -dimensional quadratic polynomials and the matrix  $U_\vartheta$  is given by

$$U_\vartheta = \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}_\vartheta} \left( \left[ \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(1)) \right] \left[ \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0)) - g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(1)) \right]^\top \right),$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}_\vartheta}$  denotes the expectation under the measure on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  for which  $\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0) \sim \bar{\mu}_\vartheta$ . But  $\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}_\vartheta} \left[ \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0)) g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(1))^\top \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}_\vartheta} \left[ \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0)) \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0))^\top \right]$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} U_\vartheta &= \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}_\vartheta} \left[ g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(1)) g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(1))^\top \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}_\vartheta} \left[ \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0)) \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^{\vartheta, \text{hom}}(0))^\top \right] \\ &= \int g^\vartheta(x) g^\vartheta(x)^\top \bar{\mu}_\vartheta(dx) - \int \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(x) \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta(x)^\top \bar{\mu}_\vartheta(dx). \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

The latter term is the  $(\mathbb{P}_\vartheta)$ -limit of the claimed expressions by Corollary 5.9.  $\square$

Corollary 5.12 tells us that once an expression for  $g^\vartheta$  and  $\bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta$  is found, the asymptotic covariance matrix  $U_\vartheta$  from Theorem 5.11 can be easily estimated by (5.17) or, if one works with a polynomial state space model of order 4, explicitly calculated using (5.18). This is done in Sections 3.2 and 3.3. Finding an analytical expression for  $g^\vartheta$  and  $h^\vartheta := \bar{P}_\vartheta g^\vartheta$ , which is the content of Proposition 3.9, reduces to knowing the quadratic polynomial coefficients of the conditional quasi-score and to a simple matrix inversion, see the construction in the proof of Lemma 5.10. This is in sharp contrast to the complicated methods needed for estimation of  $U_\vartheta$  in non-polynomial VARMA models, see for example Boubacar Mainassara and Francq [26, Section 4], Francq et al. [58, Section 5.2], or Schlemm and Stelzer [100, p. 2197]. There, an estimator of  $U_\vartheta$  is derived from the spectral density of  $Z^\vartheta(t, t-1)$  under the assumption that  $X$  has  $(8+\delta)$ th moments and that the conditional score possesses an infinite-order autoregressive representation, which is then estimated by a least-squares autoregression. In addition, these methods are only applicable for estimating  $U_\vartheta$  at  $\theta = \vartheta$  which can turn out to be insufficient, for example in the context of hypothesis testing using the Lagrange Multiplier test, see Section 3.4. This is remedied by a different estimator in Boubacar Mainassara [24] and Boubacar Mainassara et al. [25].

Theorem 5.11 establishes the asymptotic normality condition needed in Proposition 5.3, which is taken from Jacod and Sørensen [70]. For our consistency proof of the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator for the polynomial state space model, we now focus our attention on the uniform convergence condition from Proposition 5.3. This is the goal of the next section.

## 5.2.2 A law of large numbers for the observed Fisher information

We now turn to establishing the uniform law of large numbers-type result for  $\frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t)$  from Proposition 5.3, where  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  is the  $(k \times k)$ -matrix whose  $ij$ -th entry is  $\partial_{\theta_i} Z^\theta(t)_j$ , i.e. the Hessian matrix of the quasi-log-likelihood  $L^\theta(t) = \log q_t^\theta(X_0(1), \dots, X_0(t))$  with respect to  $\theta$ . Due to the obvious similarities to the observed Fisher information matrix from classic statistical theory, we will generally refer to  $\frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t)$  as the observed Fisher information.

Up to a handful of arguments, the convergence proof for the observed Fisher information can be handled by exactly the same techniques as established in the preceding section. After representing  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  explicitly, we proceed by augmenting the process  $\bar{X}^\theta(t)$  with second derivatives of the Kálmán filter  $\hat{X}^\theta(t, t-1)$  with respect to  $\theta$  and then establishing basic ergodicity properties of this augmented process. Proposition 3.6 provides such a closed form for the observed Fisher information.



*Proof of Proposition 3.6:* The result follows by differentiating the  $j$ -th component of the quasi-score (3.1) with respect to  $\theta_i$ , similar to how it was done in Proposition 3.5, and using the identities from Petersen and Pedersen [90].  $\square$

The specific lengthy form of the observed Fisher information in (3.2) is not of crucial importance. The main observation here is that its structure is similar to that of the quasi-score from equation (3.1). In particular,  $\nabla_{\theta} Z^{\theta}(t, t-1)$  is a  $(k \times k)$ -dimensional quadratic polynomial in  $\underline{X}^{\theta}(t)$  with time-varying coefficients, where  $\underline{X}^{\theta}$  is the  $E \times \mathbb{R}^{d(k^2+k+1)}$ -valued process  $\underline{X}^{\theta}(t) := (X(t), \widehat{X}^{\theta}(t), V^{\theta}(t), W^{\theta}(t))^{\top}$ , which has the same form as  $\overline{X}^{\theta}$  in the preceding section but augmented by all second derivatives of the Kálmán filtered component. Then the dynamics of  $\underline{X}^{\theta}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}$  can be written for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  as

$$\underline{X}^{\theta}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{a}^{\theta} \\ \partial_{\theta_1} \partial_{\theta_1} a^{\theta} \\ \partial_{\theta_1} \partial_{\theta_2} a^{\theta} \\ \vdots \\ \partial_{\theta_k} \partial_{\theta_k} a^{\theta} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}^{\theta}(t) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \circ & F^{\theta}(t-1) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \circ & 0 & F^{\theta}(t-1) & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \circ & 0 & 0 & \dots & F^{\theta}(t-1) \end{pmatrix} \underline{X}^{\theta}(t-1) + \begin{pmatrix} \bar{N}^{\theta}(t) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.20)$$

where  $\bar{a}^{\theta}$  and  $\bar{A}^{\theta}(t)$  are the state transition vector and the time-dependent state transition matrix of  $\overline{X}^{\theta}$ , where  $\bar{N}^{\theta}$  denotes the martingale difference sequence for  $\overline{X}^{\theta}$  from (5.5), and where  $\circ$  denotes some irrelevant submatrix of suitable dimensionality. For the matrices  $R_{ij}^{\theta}(t, t-1)$  from Proposition 3.6, it is not hard to see that by Proposition 2.13

$$R_{ij}^{\theta}(t, t-1) = F^{\theta}(t-1)R_{ij}^{\theta}(t, t-1)F^{\theta}(t-1)^{\top} + \text{terms converging uniformly in } \theta. \quad (5.21)$$

Hence, by the same reasoning as in Lemma 3.7 for the matrices  $S_j^{\theta}(t, t-1)$ , there exist matrices  $R_{ij}^{\theta}$  for  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that, uniformly in  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $R_{ij}^{\theta}(t, t-1) \rightarrow R_{ij}^{\theta}$  at a geometric rate. Simple differentiation as in Propositions 3.5 or 3.6 and similar algebraic manipulations as in equation (5.21) show for any  $i, j, l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  we have

$$\partial_{\theta_l} R_{ij}^{\theta}(t, t-1) = F^{\theta}(t-1)\partial_{\theta_l} R_{ij}^{\theta}(t, t-1)F^{\theta}(t-1)^{\top} + \text{terms uniformly bounded in } \theta \quad (5.22)$$

because all third derivatives of  $C^{\theta}(t)$  are uniformly bounded in  $\theta$  by Assumption A. Lemma A.10.1 then yields that all derivatives  $\partial_{\theta_l} R_{ij}^{\theta}(t, t-1)$  are uniformly bounded in  $\theta$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ .

In consequence, we can approximate  $\underline{X}^{\theta}$  by the time-homogeneous Markov chain  $\underline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  defined by transition dynamics identical to  $\underline{X}^{\theta}$  but with the limiting matrices  $\widehat{\Sigma}^{\theta}$ ,  $S_j^{\theta}$  and  $R_{ij}^{\theta}$  in place of  $\widehat{\Sigma}^{\theta}(t, t-1)$ ,  $S_j^{\theta}(t, t-1)$  and  $R_{ij}^{\theta}(t, t-1)$ , respectively, for  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Since the structure of the state transition matrix of  $\underline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  is completely analogous to the state transition matrix of  $\overline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$ , we can show existence of a stationary distribution  $\mu_{\theta}$  for  $\underline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  as well as weak ergodicity and boundedness in  $L^{4+\delta}$  of  $\underline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  by the exact same argument as given in Proposition 5.6 for  $\overline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$ . Since  $\underline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  is a polynomial state space model of order 2 just as  $\overline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$ , we have that  $\underline{X}^{\theta}(t) - \underline{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^{4+\delta}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}$  at a geometric rate, just as in Proposition 5.8. We obtain the following analogue of Corollary 5.9:

**Corollary 5.13.** *For any  $\theta \in \Theta$ , the process  $\underline{X}^{\theta}$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}(\mathbb{P}_{\theta})$  and weakly  $f$ -ergodic with respect to  $\mu_{\theta}$  for any polynomial  $f : E \times \mathbb{R}^{d(k^2+k+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of degree 4 or less. In particular,  $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}^{\underline{X}^{\theta}(t)} \xrightarrow{w} \mu_{\theta}$  as well as  $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^{\theta}(s)) \rightarrow \int f d\mu_{\theta}$  in  $L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\theta})$  and  $\theta \mapsto \int f d\mu_{\theta}$  is continuous. Moreover,  $\mathbb{E}_{\theta} [f(\underline{X}^{\theta}(t))] \rightarrow \int f d\mu_{\theta}$  at a geometric rate if  $f$  is quadratic (resp. quartic if Assumption A' holds).*

*Proof.* The only new statement that has not been covered before and needs to be verified is the continuity of the function  $\theta \mapsto \int f d\mu_\theta$  for any polynomial  $f$  of degree 4. Equivalently, it needs to be proven that the function  $\theta \mapsto \int f d\mu_\theta$  is continuous, where  $f : x \mapsto x^{\otimes p}$  for any  $p \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ . For such  $f$  we first claim that the sequence of expectations  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta [f(\underline{X}^\theta(t)) \mid X(0) = x]$  is continuous in the parameter  $\theta$ . In order to see this, let  $\underline{a}^\theta$  and  $\underline{A}^\theta(t)$  denote the state transition vector and time-dependent state transition matrix of  $\underline{X}^\theta$ . Moreover, let  $\underline{N}^\theta$  denote the martingale difference sequence for  $\underline{X}^\theta$  from (5.20). If we substitute  $\underline{b}^\theta(t) := \underline{a}^\theta + \underline{N}^\theta(t)$ , iterating the dynamic equation for the process  $\underline{X}^\theta$  yields the closed-form expression

$$\underline{X}^\theta(t) = \sum_{s=1}^t \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \left( \underline{A}^\theta(u) \right) \underline{b}^\theta(s) + \left( \prod_{s=0}^{t-1} \underline{A}^\theta(u) \right) \underline{X}^\theta(0).$$

For simplicity, we assume that  $p = 2$  and that  $\underline{X}^\theta(0) = 0$ . The general case of higher order  $p$  and  $\underline{X}^\theta(0) \neq 0$  can be obtained completely analogously but with higher notational effort. Let  $\mu_{s,w}(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_\vartheta [\underline{b}^\theta(s) \otimes \underline{b}^\theta(w) \mid X(0) = x]$ , which is continuously differentiable in  $\theta$  by thrice continuous differentiability assumed in Assumption B. Moreover, since  $\underline{N}^\theta$  is bounded in  $L^{4+\delta}$ ,  $\mu_{s,w}(\theta)$  and its derivatives are uniformly bounded in  $s, w$  and  $\theta$ . Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \underline{X}^\theta(t)^{\otimes 2} \mid X(0) = x \right] = \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{w=1}^t \left[ \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{A}^\theta(u) \otimes \prod_{u=w}^{t-1} \underline{A}^\theta(u) \right] \mu_{s,w}(\theta). \quad (5.23)$$

Moreover, the proof of Lemma 3.7 shows that  $\underline{A}^\theta(t) \rightarrow \underline{A}^\theta$  uniformly on  $\Theta$  for some matrix  $\underline{A}^\theta$  which is continuous in  $\theta$  with  $\rho(\underline{A}^\theta) < 1$  because  $\underline{A}^\theta$  is a block lower-triangular matrix whose submatrices on the main diagonal have spectral radius less than 1. Additionally, the matrices  $\partial_{\theta_l} \underline{A}^\theta(t)$  are uniformly bounded in  $\theta$  and  $t$  for any  $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  because they depend on  $t$  only through the matrices  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and its inverse,  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$ ,  $R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$ , and  $\partial_{\theta_l} R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$  which are uniformly bounded in  $\theta$  and  $t$  for any  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

All in all, Lemma A.7 and Corollary A.9 can now be applied to show that there exist  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$  we have  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{A}^\theta(s+m) \dots \underline{A}^\theta(s+1)\| \leq c\gamma^m$  as well as  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\partial_{\theta_l} [\underline{A}^\theta(s+m) \dots \underline{A}^\theta(s+1)]\| \leq c\gamma^m$ . Differentiating (5.23) with respect to  $\theta_l$ , applying  $\|A \otimes B\| = \|A\| \cdot \|B\|$  as well as the Kronecker product rule  $\partial(A \otimes B) = (\partial A) \otimes B + A \otimes (\partial B)$ , it is then not hard to see that also  $\partial_{\theta_l} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta (\underline{X}^\theta(t)^{\otimes 2} \mid X(0) = x)$  is bounded uniformly in  $t$  and  $\theta$  for any  $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Since all partial derivatives  $\partial_{\theta_l} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta [f(\underline{X}^\theta(t)) \mid X(0) = x]$  are uniformly bounded in  $t$  and  $\theta$ , the sequence  $(\mathbb{E}_\vartheta [f(\underline{X}^\theta(t)) \mid X(0) = x])_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is equicontinuous by the multivariate mean value theorem, see for example Theorem A.12, and it converges pointwise for  $\lambda_E$ -almost any  $x \in E$ , see Theorem A.1. Since equicontinuity and pointwise convergence imply uniform convergence on compacta,  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta [f(\underline{X}^\theta(t)) \mid X(0) = x] \rightarrow \int f d\mu_\theta$  uniformly on the compact space  $\Theta$ , and hence  $\int f d\mu_\theta$  is also continuous in  $\theta$ .  $\square$

The continuity of the limiting constant  $\int f d\mu_\theta$  in  $\theta$  will mostly be needed for technical reasons to ensure measurability of any uncountable suprema occurring in the sequel. In order to prove the desired uniform law of large numbers for  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta$ , we need two more auxiliary results concerning the process  $\underline{X}^\theta$ . The first one given in the following lemma strengthens the  $L^p$ -boundedness of  $\underline{X}^\theta$  to an  $L^p$ -boundedness uniform in  $\theta$ . The second result then establishes uniformity in the above ergodic theorem 5.13 for the process  $\underline{X}^\theta$ .

**Lemma 5.14.** *We have  $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\|^p \right] < \infty$  for any  $1 \leq p \leq 4 + \delta$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\|^q \right]^{\frac{1}{q}}$  for  $1 \leq p \leq q$  by Hölder's inequality, it suffices to prove the claim for  $p = 4 + \delta$ . By (5.5) and (5.20) we can write

$$\underline{X}^\theta(t) =: \begin{pmatrix} X(t) \\ \chi^\theta(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a^\theta \\ r^\theta \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} A^\theta & 0 \\ \underline{G}^\theta(t-1) & \underline{F}^\theta(t-1) \end{pmatrix} \underline{X}^\theta(t-1) + \begin{pmatrix} N^\theta(t) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.24)$$

where  $r^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d(k^2+k+1)}$ ,  $\underline{G}^\theta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(k^2+k+1) \times d}$  and  $\underline{F}^\theta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(k^2+k+1) \times d(k^2+k+1)}$  are continuous in  $\theta$ . Moreover, the proof of Lemma 3.7 shows that  $\underline{F}^\theta(t) \rightarrow \underline{F}^\theta$  uniformly on  $\Theta$  for some matrix  $\underline{F}^\theta$  that is continuous in  $\theta$  with  $\rho(\underline{F}^\theta) < 1$  because  $\underline{F}^\theta$  is a block lower-triangular matrix whose submatrices on the main diagonal are just repeated copies of the matrix  $F^\theta$  and  $\rho(F^\theta) < 1$  by the proof of Lemma 3.7. Lemma A.7 shows moreover that there exist constants  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{F}^\theta(s+m)\underline{F}^\theta(s+m-1)\dots\underline{F}^\theta(s+1)\| \leq c\gamma^m$  holds for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . By iterating equation (5.24) we obtain the following decomposition for  $\chi^\theta(t)$ :

$$\chi^\theta(t) = \underbrace{\sum_{s=1}^t \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) r^\theta}_{(1)} + \underbrace{\sum_{s=1}^t \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) \underline{G}^\theta(s-1) X(s-1)}_{(2)} + \underbrace{\left[ \prod_{u=0}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right] \chi^\theta(0)}_{(3)}. \quad (5.25)$$

For a family  $Y = (Y(\theta))_{\theta \in \Theta}$  of random variables indexed by  $\theta \in \Theta$ , we now write  $\|Y\|_{L^p}$  for  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|Y(\theta)\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$ . By the Minkowski-type inequality  $\|Y_1 + Y_2\|_{L^p} \leq \|Y_1\|_{L^p} + \|Y_2\|_{L^p}$  proven in Lemma A.14 for two such families  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$ , it follows that

$$\|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\|_{L^p} \leq \|X(t)\|_{L^p} + \|\chi^\theta(t)\|_{L^p} = \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \|X(t)\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\chi^\theta(t)\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Since the first summand on the right is bounded in  $t$ , it suffices to prove boundedness of the second summand on the right. Since the matrices  $\underline{G}^\theta(t)$  are continuous in  $\theta$  and depend on  $t$  only through the matrices  $\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and its inverse,  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$  and  $R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$  which are uniformly bounded in  $\theta$  and  $t$  for any  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , we can find some  $M \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\|\underline{G}^\theta(t)\| \leq M$  and  $\|r^\theta\| \leq M$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ . For the deterministic summand (1) in (5.25) we see that  $\|(1)\| \leq cM \sum_{s=1}^t \gamma^{t-s}$ , which is bounded in  $t$ . Likewise, also the deterministic summand (3) in (5.25) is bounded in  $t$ . To handle (2), observe that

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) \underline{G}^\theta(s-1) \right\| \leq cM \sum_{s=1}^t \gamma^{t-s},$$

which is likewise bounded in  $t$ . Lemma A.14 then yields that  $\|(2)\|_{L^p}$  is bounded in  $t$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.15.** *For any  $m$ -dimensional polynomial  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d(k^2+k+2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  of order 4 or less we have that  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^\theta(s)) - \int f d\mu_\theta \right\| > \varepsilon \right) \rightarrow 0$  holds for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $f(x)$  is of the form  $f(x) = A_4 x^{\otimes 4} + \dots + A_1 x^{\otimes 1} + a_0$  for some matrices  $A_j \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d^j(k^2+k+2)^j}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ , and some  $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , it suffices to prove the claim for  $f(x) = x^{\otimes j}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ . We focus on the case  $j = 4$  as  $1 \leq j \leq 3$  follow similarly. By thrice continuous differentiability assumed in Assumption A,  $r^\theta$ ,  $\underline{G}^\theta(t)$  and  $\underline{F}^\theta(t)$  in (5.24) are continuously differentiable in  $\theta$ . As in the proof of Lemma 5.14, fix  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{F}^\theta(s+m)\underline{F}^\theta(s+m-1)\dots\underline{F}^\theta(s+1)\| \leq c\gamma^m$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Simple differentiation as in Propositions 3.5 or 3.6 yields that  $\partial_{\theta_i} \underline{F}^\theta(t)$  and  $\partial_{\theta_i} \underline{G}^\theta(t)$  depend on  $t$  only through

$\widehat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and its inverse,  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$ ,  $R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$  as well as  $\partial_{\theta_l} R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$  for  $i, j, l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Similar manipulations as in equation (5.21) show

$$\partial_{\theta_l} R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1) = F^\theta(t-1) \partial_{\theta_l} R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1) F^\theta(t-1)^\top + \text{terms uniformly bounded in } \theta$$

because all third derivatives of  $C^\theta(t)$  are uniformly bounded in  $\theta$  by Assumption A. Lemma A.10.1 then yields that all partial derivatives  $\partial_{\theta_l} R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$  are uniformly bounded in  $\theta$  and  $t$  and hence the sequences  $\partial_{\theta_l} \underline{F}^\theta(t)$  and  $\partial_{\theta_l} \underline{G}^\theta(t)$  are also bounded uniformly in  $t$  and  $\theta$ .

Fix now  $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$  as well as  $x \in E$ . By (5.25) we have that  $\chi^\theta(t) - \chi^{\theta'}(t)$  is of the form

$$\sum_{s=1}^t \left[ \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) r^\theta - \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^{\theta'}(u) \right) r^{\theta'} + \left[ \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) \underline{G}^\theta(s-1) - \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^{\theta'}(u) \right) \underline{G}^{\theta'}(s-1) \right] X(s-1) \right] + \left[ \prod_{u=0}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) - \prod_{u=0}^{t-1} \underline{F}^{\theta'}(u) \right] \chi^\theta(0).$$

Integration by parts yields that the partial derivative  $\partial_{\theta_l} \left( \prod_{u=s}^t \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right)$  for  $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  is given by

$$\left[ \partial_{\theta_l} \underline{F}^\theta(t) \right] \underline{F}^\theta(t-1) \dots \underline{F}^\theta(s) + \underline{F}^\theta(t) \left[ \partial_{\theta_l} \underline{F}^\theta(t-1) \right] \dots \underline{F}^\theta(s) + \dots + \underline{F}^\theta(t) \dots \underline{F}^\theta(s+1) \left[ \partial_{\theta_l} \underline{F}^\theta(s) \right].$$

If  $M \geq 1$  is fixed such that  $\|\partial_{\theta_l} \underline{F}^\theta(t)\| \leq M$ ,  $\|\underline{G}^\theta(t)\| \leq M$ ,  $\|\partial_{\theta_l} \underline{G}^\theta(t)\| \leq M$ ,  $\|r^\theta\| \leq M$ , and  $\|\partial_{\theta_l} r^\theta\| \leq M$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and since  $c \geq 1$  can be assumed without loss of generality, it follows that  $\|\partial_{\theta_l} \left( \prod_{u=s}^t \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right)\| \leq c^2 M(t-s+1) \gamma^{t-s}$ . Hence we have for  $s \leq t$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$  that

$$\left\| \partial_{\theta_l} \left[ \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) r^\theta \right] \right\| \leq M \left\| \partial_{\theta_l} \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) \right\| + M \left\| \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) \right\| \leq c^2 M^2 (t-s+1) \gamma^{t-s-1}$$

and  $\|\partial_{\theta_l} \left[ \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) \underline{G}^\theta(s-1) \right]\| \leq c^2 M^2 (t-s+1) \gamma^{t-s-1}$ . Theorem A.12 yields

$$\left\| \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) r^\theta - \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^{\theta'}(u) \right) r^{\theta'} \right\| \leq \sqrt{k} c^2 M^2 (t-s+1) \gamma^{t-s-1} \|\theta - \theta'\|$$

and  $\left\| \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) \right) \underline{G}^\theta(s-1) - \left( \prod_{u=s}^{t-1} \underline{F}^{\theta'}(u) \right) \underline{G}^{\theta'}(s-1) \right\| \leq \sqrt{k} d c^2 M^2 (t-s+1) \gamma^{t-s-1} \|\theta - \theta'\|$ . Since  $\chi^\theta(0)$  is deterministic, we can moreover assume that  $\|\chi^\theta(0)\| \leq M$  so that we have

$$\left\| \left[ \prod_{u=0}^{t-1} \underline{F}^\theta(u) - \prod_{u=0}^{t-1} \underline{F}^{\theta'}(u) \right] \chi^\theta(0) \right\| \leq \sqrt{k} c^2 M^2 t \gamma^{t-1} \|\theta - \theta'\|.$$

Since  $\|\underline{X}^\theta(t) - \underline{X}^{\theta'}(t)\| = \|\chi^\theta(t) - \chi^{\theta'}(t)\|$  by definition, we altogether obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t) - \underline{X}^{\theta'}(t)\| &\leq C \|\theta - \theta'\| \sum_{s=1}^t (t-s+1) \gamma^{t-s-1} \left( 1 + \|X(s-1)\| \right) + C \|\theta - \theta'\| t \gamma^{t-1} \\ &= C \|\theta - \theta'\| \left[ t \gamma^{t-1} + \sum_{s=1}^t s \gamma^{s-2} \left( 1 + \|X(t-s)\| \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

for  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , where  $C := \sqrt{k} d c^2 M^2$ . Our strategy to prove the claimed uniform convergence consists now of using this upper bound to show the uniform stochastic equicontinuity condition from Theorem A.20. We first show that  $k(\varepsilon) := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| < \alpha} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t) - \underline{X}^{\theta'}(t)\| > \varepsilon \right) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Inserting the inequality (5.26) yields

$$k(\varepsilon) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( C \alpha \left[ t \gamma^{t-1} + \sum_{s=1}^t s \gamma^{s-2} \left( 1 + \|X(t-s)\| \right) \right] > \varepsilon \right)$$

$$\leq C \frac{\alpha}{\varepsilon} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[ t y^{t-1} + \sum_{s=1}^t s y^{s-2} \left( 1 + \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \|X(t-s)\| \right] \right) \right],$$

where the superior limit on the right-hand side is finite because  $X$  is bounded in  $L^1$ . Hence  $k(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , as claimed. Let  $\eta, \nu > 0$  be arbitrary. Since  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\| \right]$  is bounded by Lemma 5.14, there is  $K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\| > K \right) < \frac{\nu}{2}$ . Now, the function  $f : x \mapsto x^{\otimes 4}$  is uniformly continuous on compacta, so we can find  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\|f(x) - f(y)\| < \eta$  whenever  $\|x - y\| \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\|x\| \leq K$ . Let  $\Xi_\alpha(t) := \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| < \alpha} \|f(\underline{X}^\theta(t)) - f(\underline{X}^{\theta'}(t))\|$  and  $k(\eta, f) := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \Xi_\alpha(t) > \eta \right)$ . Then

$$k(\eta, f) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| < \alpha} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t) - \underline{X}^{\theta'}(t)\| > \varepsilon \right) + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\| > K \right).$$

The first summand on the right is  $k(\varepsilon)$ . Hence we can find  $\alpha > 0$  small enough such that  $k(\varepsilon) < \frac{\nu}{2}$ , so  $k(\eta, f) < \nu$ . In other words,  $k(\eta, f) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . For arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can now write

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(t) \right] &\leq \varepsilon + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(t) \mathbb{1}_{\{\Xi_\alpha(t) > \varepsilon\}} \right] \leq \varepsilon + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(t)^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \right]^{\frac{4}{\delta+4}} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \Xi_\alpha(t) > \varepsilon \right)^{\frac{\delta}{\delta+4}} \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(t)^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \right]^{\frac{4}{\delta+4}} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \Xi_\alpha(t) > \varepsilon \right)^{\frac{\delta}{\delta+4}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Hölder's inequality. The second factor on the right side converges to 0 as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  because  $k(\varepsilon, f) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . But as  $(a+b)^p \leq 2^{p-1}(a^p + b^p)$  for  $a, b > 0$  and any  $p \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(t)^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \right] &= \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| < \alpha} \|f(\underline{X}^\theta(t)) - f(\underline{X}^{\theta'}(t))\|^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \right) \leq 2^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|f(\underline{X}^\theta(t))\|^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \right) \\ &= 2^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\|^{\otimes 4} \right)^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} = 2^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\|^{4+\delta} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\|A \otimes B\| = \|A\| \cdot \|B\|$  for any matrices  $A$  and  $B$ . The expected value on the right hand side is bounded in  $t$  by Lemma 5.14, so  $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(t)^{\frac{4+\delta}{4}} \right] < \infty$ . Combined with the above we obtain  $\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(t) \right] \leq \varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, it follows that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(t) \right] \rightarrow 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t a_s \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} a_t$  for any sequence  $(a_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  of real numbers (see Goldberg [59, Exercise 2.9.7]), we also find that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(s) \right] \rightarrow 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . Finally,

$$\mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| < \alpha} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^\theta(s)) - \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^{\theta'}(s)) \right\| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \Xi_\alpha(s) > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{t\varepsilon} \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \Xi_\alpha(s) \right],$$

so  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_\vartheta \left( \sup_{\|\theta - \theta'\| < \alpha} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^\theta(s)) - \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^{\theta'}(s)) \right\| > \varepsilon \right) \rightarrow 0$  whenever  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ . This is the uniform stochastic equicontinuity condition from Theorem A.20. Since we have  $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^\theta(s)) \rightarrow \int f \, d\mu_\theta$  in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability for any fixed  $\theta$  and since  $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^\theta(s))$  and  $\int f \, d\mu_\theta$  are continuous in  $\theta$  by Corollary 5.13, all prerequisites for Theorem A.20 are fulfilled and we can deduce  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(\underline{X}^\theta(s)) - \int f \, d\mu_\theta \right\| \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main result of this section, assumed in Proposition 5.2:

**Proposition 5.16.** *There exists a continuous matrix-valued function  $W : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  such that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) - W(\theta) \right\| \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability.*

*Proof.* By continuity of  $W$  all suprema over  $\Theta$  are measurable by Lemma A.19. Since  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  is a  $(k \times k)$ -dimensional quadratic polynomial of  $\underline{X}^\theta(t)$ , it is of the form

$$\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t, t-1) = \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \beta_\lambda^\theta(t) \underline{X}^\theta(t)^\lambda := \tilde{f}^\theta(t, \underline{X}^\theta(t)),$$

where the sum extends over the  $d(k^2 + k + 2)$ -dimensional multi-indices  $\lambda$  and where  $\beta_\lambda^\theta(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ . As in the proof of Theorem 5.11, all coefficients  $\beta_\lambda^\theta(t)$  depend on  $t$  only through products of the Kálmán filter covariance matrices  $\hat{\Sigma}^\theta(t, t-1)$  and its inverse, the matrices  $S_j^\theta(t, t-1)$ , and  $R_{ij}^\theta(t, t-1)$ , see the explicit representation in equation (3.2). Since these matrices converge as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly on  $\Theta$ , there exist limiting coefficients  $\beta_\lambda^\theta$ , continuous in  $\theta$ , such that  $\beta_\lambda^\theta(t) \rightarrow \beta_\lambda^\theta$  uniformly in  $\theta$ . Let  $\tilde{f}^\theta(y) := \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \beta_\lambda^\theta y^\lambda$  denote the  $(k \times k)$ -dimensional quadratic polynomial with these limiting coefficients, see also equation (3.7). Define the matrix-valued function  $W(\theta) := \int \tilde{f}^\theta d\mu_\theta$ , which is continuous because the limiting coefficients  $\beta_\lambda^\theta$  are continuous in  $\theta$  and by Corollary 5.13. We can then decompose the Fisher information as

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) - W(\theta) \right\| \leq \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \tilde{f}^\theta(\underline{X}^\theta(s)) - W(\theta) \right\|}_{(1)} + \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} [\beta_\lambda^\theta(s) - \beta_\lambda^\theta] \underline{X}^\theta(s)^\lambda \right\|}_{(2)}.$$

The summand (1) converges to 0 in probability by Lemma 5.15. For (2) we find that

$$\mathbb{E}_\vartheta [(2)] \leq \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\beta_\lambda^\theta(s) - \beta_\lambda^\theta\| \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(s)^\lambda\| \right].$$

Since  $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)\|^2 \right] < \infty$  by Lemma 5.14, it follows by the same calculations as in Lemma A.16 that also  $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\underline{X}^\theta(t)^\lambda\| \right] < \infty$  for any  $\lambda$  with  $|\lambda| \leq 2$ . It follows that we can find a constant  $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta [(2)] \leq \frac{C}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\beta_\lambda^\theta(s) - \beta_\lambda^\theta\|$  and the arithmetic mean on the right-hand side converges to 0 because  $\beta_\lambda^\theta(t) \rightarrow \beta_\lambda^\theta$  uniformly in  $\theta$  and because convergence of a sequence implies convergence of the sequence in Cesàro mean. So we have shown that (2) converges to 0 in  $L^1$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ .  $\square$

### 5.2.3 Proof of consistency and asymptotic normality

The final ingredient for the proof of our main Theorems 3.3, 3.4 is the fact that  $\frac{1}{t} L^\theta(t)$  converges in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability uniformly in  $\theta$  to some twice continuously differentiable  $Q$  that is uniquely maximised at the true parameter value  $\vartheta$ . Recall from the proof of Proposition 5.16 that the Fisher information matrix  $W(\theta)$  is given by  $\int \tilde{f}^\theta d\mu_\theta$ , where  $\tilde{f}^\theta$  denotes the quadratic polynomial describing the limiting dependence of  $\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  on  $\underline{X}^\theta(t)$  given in (3.7). We start by showing that the same limit  $W(\theta)$  can be achieved by considering the likelihood of

$$Y^{\text{stat}}(t) = a^\theta + A^\theta Y^{\text{stat}}(t-1) + B^\theta W^\theta(t),$$

which is a stationary Markov chain and was introduced in equation (2.7). To do so, define the Gaussian densities  $\tilde{q}_t^\theta := d\mathbb{P}_\vartheta^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(1), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))} / d\lambda_{t(d-m)}$  as well as the conditional Gaussian densities  $\tilde{q}_{t|t-1}^\theta(\cdot \mid y_1, \dots, y_{t-1})$  of the conditional distribution of  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t)$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  given  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}(1) =$

$y_1, \dots, Y_o^{\text{stat}}(t-1) = y_{t-1}$ . The closed form of  $\log \tilde{q}_{t|t-1}^\theta$  is similar to the closed form of  $\log q_{t|t-1}^\theta$  given in (2.6) with the only exception that the time-dependent matrices  $C^\theta(t+1)$  in Proposition 2.8 are replaced by the limiting matrices  $C^\theta$  and that the initial mean and covariance matrix differ. We write  $L_Y^\theta(t) := \log q_t^\theta(Y_o(1), \dots, Y_o(t))$  as well as  $\tilde{L}_Y^\theta(t) := \log \tilde{q}_t^\theta(Y_o^{\text{stat}}(1), \dots, Y_o^{\text{stat}}(t))$ . Moreover, we define the scores  $Z_Y^\theta(t) := \nabla_\theta L_Y^\theta(t)$  and  $\tilde{Z}_Y^\theta(t) := \nabla_\theta \tilde{L}_Y^\theta(t)$  as well as the observed Fisher information  $\nabla_\theta Z_Y^\theta(t)$  and  $\nabla_\theta \tilde{Z}_Y^\theta(t)$ . The closed-form expressions for the score process  $\tilde{Z}_Y^\theta(t)$  and the observed Fisher information  $\nabla_\theta \tilde{Z}_Y^\theta(t)$  are again analogous to the ones given in Propositions 3.5 and 3.6 with  $C^\theta$  in place of  $C^\theta(t)$ .

We know that  $L^\theta(t, t-1) = \log q_{t|t-1}^\theta(X_o(t) | X_o(1), \dots, X_o(t-1))$  is a quadratic polynomial in  $\bar{X}^\theta(t)$  with time-dependent coefficients. If we replace  $X$  by  $Y$  in this log-likelihood, we can define an  $\mathbb{R}^{d(k+2)}$ -valued process  $\bar{Y}^\theta$  in exactly the same manner as we defined  $\bar{X}^\theta$  but with  $Y$  in place of  $X$  so that  $\log q_{t|t-1}^\theta(Y_o(t) | Y_o(1), \dots, Y_o(t-1))$  is a quadratic polynomial in  $\bar{Y}^\theta$ . In other words, we have coefficients  $\gamma_\lambda^\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  and multi-indices  $\lambda$  such that

$$L_Y^\theta(t) = \log q_t^\theta(Y_o(1), \dots, Y_o(t)) = \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \gamma_\lambda^\theta(s) \bar{Y}^\theta(s)^\lambda. \quad (5.27)$$

It is easy to see that  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  is a parametric polynomial state space model of order 2 that fulfils Assumptions A, B, C. In particular, we can repeat the construction from Section 5.2.1 for  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  instead of  $X$  to obtain the augmented process  $\bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}$  and its homogeneous counterpart  $\bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  in place of  $\bar{X}^\theta$  and  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$ , respectively. We then find that:

**Lemma 5.17.**  $\bar{Y}^\theta(t) - \bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(t) \xrightarrow{L^p} 0$  under any  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ , for any  $\theta \in \Theta$  and any  $p \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* By definition the process  $\bar{Y}^\theta(t)$  has the same state transition vector  $\bar{a}^\theta$  and time-dependent state transition matrix  $\bar{A}^\theta(t)$  as  $\bar{X}^\theta(t)$  because the Kálmán filter covariance matrices for  $Y^\theta$  coincide with those for  $X^\theta$ . Moreover, the state transition vector of  $\bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}$  is also given by  $\bar{a}^\theta$ . Let  $\bar{A}_Y^\theta(t)$  denote the time-dependent state transition matrix for  $\bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(t)$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ . It is easy to see that the Kálmán filter covariance matrices for  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  converge to the same limit as the Kálmán filter covariance matrices for  $Y$  because the limit of the algebraic Riccati difference recursion (5.6) remains unchanged if  $B^\theta(t+1)$  is replaced by  $B^\theta$  in (5.6). It follows that  $\bar{A}^\theta(t)$  and  $\bar{A}_Y^\theta(t)$  converge to the same limit  $\bar{A}^\theta$  at a geometric rate, which is the state transition matrix of  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  and  $\bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$ . By the same calculations that were used to show that  $\bar{X}^\theta(t) - \bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^{4+\delta}$  in Proposition 5.8, it then follows that  $\bar{Y}^\theta(t) - \bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t) \xrightarrow{L^p} 0$  and  $\bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(t) - \bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t) \xrightarrow{L^p} 0$  for any  $p \geq 1$ , implying the result.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.18.** For any  $\theta \in \Theta$  we have:

1.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\theta [L^\theta(t)] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\tilde{L}_Y^\theta(t)] =: Q(\theta)$ ,
2.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\theta [Z^\theta(t)] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\tilde{Z}_Y^\theta(t)] =: G(\theta)$ ,
3.  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t)] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\nabla_\theta \tilde{Z}_Y^\theta(t)] = W(\theta)$ .

*Proof.* We prove the claim for the limits in 1. because 2. and 3. follow completely analogously. By construction we have  $\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log q_t^\theta(X_o(1), \dots, X_o(t))] = \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log q_t^\theta(Y_o(1), \dots, Y_o(t))]$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  because  $\log q_t^\theta(X_o(1), \dots, X_o(t))$  is linear in the components of  $X_o(u)X_o(s)^\top$  with

$1 \leq u, s \leq t$ , which have the same expectation as  $Y_o(u)Y_o(s)^\top$  by Proposition 2.6. In line with (5.27) and with the notation introduced further above, we can write

$$L_Y^\theta(t) := \log q_t^\theta(Y_o(1), \dots, Y_o(t)) = \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \gamma_\lambda^\theta(s) \bar{Y}^\theta(s)^\lambda,$$

$$\tilde{L}_Y^\theta(t) := \log \tilde{q}_t^\theta(Y_o^{\text{stat}}(1), \dots, Y_o^{\text{stat}}(t)) = \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \tilde{\gamma}_\lambda^\theta(s) \bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(s)^\lambda,$$

where the coefficients  $\gamma_\lambda^\theta(t)$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_\lambda^\theta(t)$  converge to the same limiting coefficients as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  because the Kálmán filter covariance matrices for  $Y$  and  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  converge to the same limits. Note that  $\bar{Y}^\theta(t)^\lambda - \bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(t)^\lambda \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^1$  for any multi-index  $\lambda$  with  $|\lambda| \leq 2$  by Lemma 5.17 and Lemma A.17. Altogether, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{t} L_Y^\theta(t) - \frac{1}{t} \tilde{L}_Y^\theta(t) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \sum_{|\lambda| \leq 2} \left[ \gamma_\lambda^\theta(s) (\bar{Y}^\theta(s)^\lambda - \bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(s)^\lambda) + (\gamma_\lambda^\theta(s) - \tilde{\gamma}_\lambda^\theta(s)) \bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}(s)^\lambda \right]$$

converges to 0 in  $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\vartheta)$ . Since we know that the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\vartheta(\tilde{L}_Y^\theta(t))$  exists and is independent of  $x$  by ergodicity of  $\bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}$  (see Corollary 5.9), the identity 1. follows.  $\square$

**Remark 5.19.** By ergodicity of  $\bar{X}^\theta$  and  $\bar{Y}^{\theta, \text{stat}}$  from Corollary 5.13, it is clear that the deterministic limits  $Q(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $G(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^k$  are also limits in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability of  $\frac{1}{t} L^\theta(t)$  and  $\frac{1}{t} Z^\theta(t)$ , respectively. In view of the uniform convergence to  $W(\theta)$  proven in Proposition 5.16, it follows from Lemma A.21 that  $W(\theta) = \nabla_\theta G(\theta)$  as well as  $G(\theta) = \nabla_\theta Q(\theta)$ , and that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} Z^\theta(t) - G(\theta) \right\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$  as well as  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} L^\theta(t) - Q(\theta) \right\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$ . This establishes the uniform convergence property from Proposition 5.2. It only remains to be verified that  $Q(\vartheta) > Q(\theta)$  for any  $\theta \neq \vartheta$ .

Our proof of the fact that  $Q(\vartheta) > Q(\theta)$  for all  $\theta \neq \vartheta$  is based on the results from Douc et al. [38] and builds on an information-theoretic approach. To this end we make use of the Kullback–Leibler divergence or relative entropy between probability measures, defined by  $\text{KL}(\mu \parallel \nu) := \int \log \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \right) d\mu$  if  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\nu$  and  $\text{KL}(\mu \parallel \nu) = \infty$  otherwise. The following notion of *exponential separation* was introduced in Douc et al. [38]:

**Definition 5.20.** For  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  let  $\mu_t$  and  $\nu_t$  denote probability measures on measurable spaces  $(E_t, \mathcal{E}_t)$ . The sequence  $(\nu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is called **exponentially separated** from  $(\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ , denoted by  $(\nu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*} \dashv (\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  if there exist sets  $A_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$  such that we have  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mu_t(A_t) > 0$  and  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \nu_t(A_t) < 0$ . If  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are probability measures on  $(E^{\mathbb{N}^*}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}^*})$  for some measurable space  $(E, \mathcal{E})$ , we write  $\nu \dashv \mu$  if  $(\nu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*} \dashv (\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ , where  $\mu_t := \mu \circ \pi_t^{-1}$ ,  $\nu_t := \nu \circ \pi_t^{-1}$ , and  $\pi_t : E^{\mathbb{N}^*} \rightarrow E^t$  denotes the canonical projection on the first  $t$  components.

The connection between the preceding definition of exponential separation and the relative entropy is given in the following lemma, which is shown in Douc et al. [38, Lemma 10].

**Lemma 5.21.** If  $(\nu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*} \dashv (\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ , then  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \text{KL}(\mu_t \parallel \nu_t) > 0$ .  $\square$



For verifying that  $Q$  has a unique maximum at the true parameter  $\vartheta$ , it suffices to show  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{Y_0^{\text{stat}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\vartheta^{Y_0^{\text{stat}}}$  for any  $\theta \neq \vartheta$ . Indeed, by definition of the Kullback–Leibler divergence this implies

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[ \log \frac{\tilde{q}_t^\vartheta(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(1), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))}{\tilde{q}_t^\theta(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(1), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))} \right] = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\tilde{L}_Y^\vartheta(t) - \tilde{L}_Y^\theta(t)] > 0,$$

i.e.  $Q(\vartheta) > Q(\theta)$  for any  $\theta \neq \vartheta$  by Proposition 5.18. The key to this exponential separation lies in the geometric ergodicity of the process  $Y^{\text{stat}}$ , a concept introduced in Definition A.3:

**Proposition 5.22.** *Under any  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ ,  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  is  $V_\theta$ -geometrically ergodic for some  $V_\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  is a polynomial state space model meeting Assumption B, we obtain from the proof of Proposition 2.12 that  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  is a  $\psi$ -irreducible, aperiodic weak Feller chain,  $\psi$  denoting Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , with unique stationary law  $\mu_{\theta, Y} := \mathcal{N}(\alpha^\theta, \Lambda^\theta)$  on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , see the discussion before Assumption C in Section 2.2. By Theorem A.4 it remains to construct a function  $V_\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  such that  $\tilde{P}_\theta V_\theta - V_\theta \leq \beta V_\theta + b \mathbb{1}_C$  for some  $\beta < 0$ , some  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and some compact  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\tilde{P}_\theta$  denotes the transition operator for the Markov chain  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ . Here, the constants  $\beta$ ,  $b$  and the set  $C$  are allowed to depend on  $\theta \in \Theta$  as well, which is suppressed in the notation. Let  $N \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be any positive definite matrix and let  $M^\theta$  be the unique positive definite solution to the Lyapunov equation  $A^{\theta^\top} M^\theta A^\theta + N$ , which is guaranteed to exist by Lemma A.10.2. Define  $V_\theta(x) = 1 + x^\top M^\theta x$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_\theta V_\theta(x) - V_\theta(x) &= a^{\theta^\top} M^\theta a^\theta + x^\top \left( A^{\theta^\top} M^\theta A^\theta - M^\theta \right) x + \text{Tr} \left( B^{\theta^\top} M^\theta B^\theta \right) + 2a^{\theta^\top} A^\theta x \\ &= a^{\theta^\top} M^\theta a^\theta + \text{Tr} \left( B^{\theta^\top} M^\theta B^\theta \right) - x^\top N x + 2a^{\theta^\top} A^\theta x \\ &\leq a^{\theta^\top} M^\theta a^\theta + \text{Tr} \left( B^{\theta^\top} M^\theta B^\theta \right) - \frac{\lambda_{\min}(N)}{\lambda_{\max}(M^\theta)} x^\top M^\theta x + 2a^{\theta^\top} A^\theta x \\ &= c_\theta + \beta_\theta V_\theta(x) + d_\theta^\top x = \beta_\theta V_\theta(x) \left( 1 + \frac{c_\theta + d_\theta^\top x}{\beta_\theta V_\theta(x)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we set  $\beta_\theta := -\frac{\lambda_{\min}(N)}{\lambda_{\max}(M^\theta)} < 0$ ,  $d_\theta := 2A^{\theta^\top} a^\theta$ , and  $c_\theta := a^{\theta^\top} M^\theta a^\theta + \text{Tr} \left( B^{\theta^\top} M^\theta B^\theta \right) - \beta_\theta$ . Since  $\frac{c_\theta + d_\theta^\top x}{\beta_\theta V_\theta(x)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$ , we can find  $K_\theta \geq 0$  such that  $1 + \frac{c_\theta + d_\theta^\top x}{\beta_\theta V_\theta(x)} > \frac{1}{2}$  for  $\|x\| \geq K_\theta$ . Define  $C_\theta := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq K_\theta\}$ . Then  $\tilde{P}_\theta V_\theta(x) - V_\theta(x) \leq \frac{\beta_\theta}{2} V_\theta(x)$  for  $x \in C_\theta^c$  and  $\tilde{P}_\theta V_\theta(x) - V_\theta(x) \leq \frac{\beta_\theta}{2} V_\theta(x) + b_\theta$  for  $x \in C_\theta$ , where  $b_\theta := \sup_{x \in C_\theta} [c_\theta + d_\theta^\top x]$ .  $\square$

Using the geometric ergodicity of  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  from above, the key step to establish the exponential separation  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{Y_0^{\text{stat}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\vartheta^{Y_0^{\text{stat}}}$  consists in proving a certain large deviations principle for geometrically ergodic Markov chains. This is done by embedding the Markov chain into some wide sense regenerative process. This splitting construction goes back to Douc et al. [38, Theorem 17]. This culminates in the following Azuma–Hoeffding-type inequality for  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}$ :

**Proposition 5.23.** *Fix  $u \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$  and let  $f : \mathbb{R}^{(d-m)(u+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be bounded and measurable. Then there is a constant  $K > 0$  depending on  $u$ ,  $f$ ,  $\theta$  such that we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta \left( \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f[Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s+u)] - \mathbb{E}_\theta [f(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))] \right| \geq \lambda \right) \leq K \exp \left[ -\frac{\lambda t}{K} (\lambda \wedge 1) \right] \quad (5.28)$$

for all  $\lambda > 0$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem 17 in Douc et al. [38], we can find  $K > 0$  for any  $V$ -geometrically ergodic  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued Markov chain  $X$  with invariant measure  $\mu$  and initial distribution  $\nu$  such that we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{t}\sum_{s=1}^t f(X(s)) - \int f \, d\mu\right| \geq \lambda\right) \leq K\left(\int V \, d\nu\right) \exp\left[-\frac{\lambda t}{K\|f\|_\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda}{\|f\|_\infty} \wedge 1\right)\right] \quad (5.29)$$

for all bounded, measurable functions  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and all  $\lambda > 0$ . Assume  $\mathbb{E}_\theta\left[f(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))\right] = 0$  without loss of generality and consider the decomposition

$$\sum_{s=1}^t f[Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s+u)] = \sum_{r=0}^u \left(\sum_{s=1}^t \xi_{s,r}^\theta\right) + \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbb{E}_\theta\left(f[Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s+u)] \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-1}\right), \quad (5.30)$$

where we define

$$\xi_{s,r}^\theta := \mathbb{E}_\theta\left(f[Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s+u)] \mid \mathcal{F}_{s+r}\right) - \mathbb{E}_\theta\left(f[Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s+u)] \mid \mathcal{F}_{s+r-1}\right)$$

for  $r = 0, \dots, u$  and  $s = 1, \dots, t$ . Since  $(\xi_{s,r}^\theta)_{s \in \{1, \dots, t\}}$  is a  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ -martingale difference sequence with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_{s+r})_{s \in \{1, \dots, t\}}$  for fixed  $r$  and since  $\|\xi_{s,r}^\theta\|_\infty \leq 2\|f\|_\infty$  for any  $s \in \{1, \dots, t\}$  and  $r \in \{0, \dots, u\}$ , the classic Azuma–Hoeffding inequality (see for example Williams [114, E.14.2(b)]) implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta\left(\left|\frac{1}{t}\sum_{s=1}^t \xi_{s,r}^\theta\right| \geq \lambda\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2 t}{8\|f\|_\infty^2}\right) \quad (5.31)$$

for any  $r \in \{0, \dots, u\}$ . Furthermore,  $\mathbb{E}_\theta\left(f[Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s+u)] \mid \mathcal{F}_{s-1}\right)$  can be written as a measurable function  $g_\theta(Y^{\text{stat}}(s-1))$  by the Markov property, where  $\int g_\theta \, d\mu_{\theta,Y} = 0$  because we assumed that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta\left[f(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))\right] = 0$ . In particular,  $\|g_\theta\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty$ . Since the process  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  is  $V_\theta$ -geometrically ergodic for some  $V_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  by Proposition 5.22, it follows from (5.29) that

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta\left(\left|\frac{1}{t}\sum_{s=1}^t g_\theta(Y^{\text{stat}}(s-1))\right| \geq \lambda\right) \leq K\left(\int V_\theta \, d\mu_{\theta,Y}\right) \exp\left[-\frac{\lambda t}{K\|f\|_\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda}{\|f\|_\infty} \wedge 1\right)\right]. \quad (5.32)$$

In particular, the integral on the right-hand side is finite because  $V_\theta$  is a quadratic polynomial by the construction in the proof of Proposition 5.22. Combining the inequalities (5.31) and (5.32) and inserting these into (5.30), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\theta\left(\left|\frac{1}{t}\sum_{s=1}^t f[Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s+u)]\right| \geq \lambda\right) &\leq \sum_{r=0}^u \mathbb{P}_\theta\left(\left|\frac{1}{t}\sum_{s=1}^t \xi_{s,r}^\theta\right| \geq \frac{\lambda}{2(u+1)}\right) + \mathbb{P}_\theta\left(\left|\frac{1}{t}\sum_{s=1}^t g_\theta(Y^{\text{stat}}(s-1))\right| \geq \frac{\lambda}{2}\right) \\ &\leq 2(u+1) \exp\left[-\frac{\lambda^2 t}{32(u+1)^2\|f\|_\infty^2}\right] + K\left(\int V_\theta \, d\mu_{\theta,Y}\right) \exp\left[-\frac{\lambda t}{2K\|f\|_\infty}\left(\frac{\lambda}{2\|f\|_\infty} \wedge 1\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Rarranging and combining the constants in the sum yields the claim.  $\square$

**Remark 5.24.** In principle the proof of the Azuma–Hoeffding-type inequality (5.28) could be shortened by deriving it directly from the simpler concentration inequality (5.29), relying on geometric ergodicity of the Markov chain  $(Y^{\text{stat}}(t), \dots, Y^{\text{stat}}(t+u))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ . This would however require a more technical construction of a suitable function  $V_\theta$  for  $V_\theta$ -geometric ergodicity of this process in the spirit of the proof of Proposition 5.22. Instead we chose the different strategy of proof presented above, which only requires  $V_\theta$ -geometric ergodicity of  $Y^{\text{stat}}$ .

At its core the preceding Theorem 5.23 establishes that the convergence of arithmetic means in  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  to corresponding expectations under the stationary distribution is geometrically fast. Finally, the following Lemma 5.25 shows that under the identifiability Assumption C, the parameters  $\theta$  and  $\vartheta$  with  $\theta \neq \vartheta$  can be distinguished by observing  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}$ :

**Lemma 5.25.** *For any  $\theta \neq \theta'$  there exists  $u \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))} \neq \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))}$ .*

*Proof.* By the considerations right before Assumption C in Section 2.2,  $\mu_{\theta, Y}$  is a Gaussian distribution and hence admits a Lebesgue density  $f_\theta^0$ . The Lebesgue density of the joint Gaussian law  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))}$  is the product of  $f_\theta^0(y_0)$  and the conditional densities of  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s)$  given  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0) = y_0, \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s-1) = y_{s-1}$  for  $s \in \{1, \dots, u\}$ . Hence it suffices to show that for any  $\theta \neq \theta'$  there exists some  $u \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that the conditional density  $f_\theta^{u|u-1}(y_u | y_0, \dots, y_{u-1})$  of  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u)$  given  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0) = y_0, \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u-1) = y_{u-1}$  differs from the corresponding conditional density  $f_{\theta'}^{u|u-1}(y_u | y_0, \dots, y_{u-1})$ . Here,  $f_\theta^{0|-1}$  is set to the unconditional density  $f_\theta^0$ . Since  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  is a Gaussian process, Kallsen and Richert [73, Proposition 3.2] yields that the conditional density  $f_\theta^{s|s-1}(y_s | y_0, \dots, y_{s-1})$  is the density of the normal distribution with mean  $\widehat{Y}_0^{\theta, \text{stat}}$  evaluated at  $Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0) = y_0, \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(s-1) = y_{s-1}$  and covariance matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_0^{\theta, \text{stat}}(s, s-1)$  given by the Kálmán filter recursions. But for any  $\theta \neq \theta'$ , there exists  $u \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\widehat{Y}_0^{\theta, \text{stat}}(u, u-1) \neq \widehat{Y}_0^{\theta', \text{stat}}(u, u-1)$  or  $\widehat{\Sigma}_0^{\theta, \text{stat}}(u, u-1) \neq \widehat{\Sigma}_0^{\theta', \text{stat}}(u, u-1)$  by Assumption C.  $\square$

The preceding lemma now finally yields the desired exponential separation property:

**Corollary 5.26.** *For any  $\theta \neq \vartheta$  the exponential separation  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{Y_0^{\text{stat}}} \dashv \mathbb{P}_\vartheta^{Y_0^{\text{stat}}}$  holds.*

*Proof.* Since  $\theta \neq \vartheta$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))} \neq \mathbb{P}_{\theta'}^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))}$  for some  $u \in \mathbb{N}$  by the preceding Lemma 5.25. Accordingly, since a measure is determined by its action on bounded measurable functions, there exists an integer  $u \in \mathbb{N}$  and a bounded measurable  $h : \mathbb{R}^{(d-m)(u+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta[h(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\vartheta[h(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(u))] = 1$ . For  $t > u$  define

$$A_t := \left\{ (y_0, \dots, y_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{(d-m)(t+1)} : \left| \frac{1}{t-u} \sum_{s=1}^{t-u} h(y_s, \dots, y_{s+u}) \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{(d-m)(t+1)}).$$

By ergodicity of  $Y^{\text{stat}}$  it follows that  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))}(A_t) \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, Theorem 5.23 shows that there exists some positive constant  $K > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))}(A_t) \leq K \exp(\frac{u-t}{4K})$ , which implies

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))}(A_t) \leq -\frac{1}{4K} < 0.$$

By definition, this establishes the exponential separation property  $\mathbb{P}_\theta^{Y_0^{\text{stat}}} \dashv \mathbb{P}_\vartheta^{Y_0^{\text{stat}}}$ .  $\square$

As noted earlier, the exponential separation property established in the preceding Corollary 5.26 yields that  $Q(\theta) < Q(\vartheta)$  for any  $\theta \neq \vartheta$ . This is the final ingredient for the proof of the main theorem which we will cite as a separate corollary here for the sake of completeness:

**Corollary 5.27.** *For any  $\theta \in \Theta$  with  $\theta \neq \vartheta$  it holds that  $Q(\theta) < Q(\vartheta)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbb{P}_{\vartheta_0}^{y^{\text{stat}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\vartheta}^{y^{\text{stat}}}$  by Corollary 5.26, we have that  $(\nu_t^\vartheta)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow (\nu_t^\vartheta)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where we set  $\nu_t^\vartheta := \mathbb{P}_{\vartheta}^{(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(0), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))}$ . Hence we obtain  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \text{KL}(\nu_t^\vartheta \parallel \nu_t^\vartheta) > 0$  by Lemma 5.21. From the definition of the Kullback–Leibler divergence it follows that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta} \left[ \log \frac{\tilde{q}_t^\vartheta(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(1), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))}{\tilde{q}_t^\vartheta(Y_0^{\text{stat}}(1), \dots, Y_0^{\text{stat}}(t))} \right] = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_{\vartheta} [\tilde{L}_Y^\vartheta(t) - \tilde{L}_Y^\vartheta(t)] > 0,$$

which is equivalent to  $Q(\vartheta) > Q(\theta)$  by Proposition 5.18. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

We are now finally ready to assemble all pieces collected throughout the preceding sections to prove our main theorems. To this end, we establish the conditions from Propositions 5.2 and 5.3:

*Proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4.* By Remark 5.19 we have  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\frac{1}{t} L^\theta(t) - Q(\theta)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$ , where  $Q$  is continuous. Since  $Q$  has a unique maximum at  $\vartheta$  by Corollary 5.27, Proposition 5.2 establishes consistency of any sequence of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators. Moreover we have that  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} Z^\vartheta(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} Z \sim N(0, U_\vartheta)$  by Theorem 5.11 and  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\nabla_\theta Z^\vartheta(t) - W(\theta)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$  by Proposition 5.16, where  $W = \nabla_\vartheta^2 Q$  by Remark 5.19. Hence the conditions from Proposition 5.3 are met if  $W(\vartheta)$  is invertible. It follows that we indeed have convergence

$$\sqrt{t}(\hat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} -W(\vartheta)Z \sim N(0, W(\vartheta)^{-1}U_\vartheta W(\vartheta)^{-1}). \quad (5.33)$$

It remains to prove that  $\frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t)|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}(t)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} W(\vartheta)$ . This follows by decomposing

$$\left\| \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t)|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}(t)} - W(\vartheta) \right\| \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\| \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z^\theta(t) - W(\theta) \right\| + \|W(\hat{\theta}(t)) - W(\vartheta)\|,$$

where the first summand on the right tends to 0 in probability by Proposition 5.16 and the second one by consistency and the continuous mapping theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 5.28.** Even though, from a theoretical point of view, the proof of Theorem 3.4 is complete, the condition of invertibility of  $W(\vartheta)$  imposed in the third statement is hard to verify because the true parameter value  $\vartheta$  is of course unknown in practice. However, once  $\vartheta$  has been consistently estimated by  $\hat{\theta}(t)$ ,  $W(\hat{\theta}(t))$  can be computed explicitly by the calculations in Section 3.3 (if Assumption A' holds) in order to verify the invertibility assumption from Theorem 3.4.

A large part of the statistical literature on asymptotic normality of (quasi-)maximum likelihood estimators in hidden Markov models or general ARMA-type models a priori assumes such an invertibility condition for some kind of expected Fisher information matrix such as  $W(\vartheta)$ . This is for example the case in Alj et al. [5], Bickel et al. [20] or Melard [84]. By contrast, Schlemm and Stelzer [100] develop a sufficient condition for invertibility of  $W(\vartheta)$ , which, however, seems at least as hard to verify as invertibility of  $W(\vartheta)$  itself. Indeed, it involves verifying a rank condition for a complicated Jacobian matrix evaluated at the true unknown parameter value  $\vartheta$ .

### 5.3 Proofs for Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4

*Proof of Proposition 3.9.* We first argue that  $\mathbb{E}_\theta [\bar{N}^\theta(t) \otimes \bar{N}^\theta(t) | \bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t-1) = x] = \bar{Q}_{\otimes 2}^\theta(x \otimes x) + \bar{Q}^\theta x + \bar{q}^\theta$  holds for any  $x \in E \times \mathbb{R}^{(k+1)d}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\bar{N}^\theta$  is defined in Corollary 5.5. This identity

follows from a simple calculation and the fact that  $\bar{N}^\theta = (N^{\theta^\top}, 0, \dots, 0)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+2)d}$ , yielding  $\bar{N}^\theta \otimes \bar{N}^\theta = e_1^{(k+2)} \circ_{d \times 1}^{(k+2) \times 1} [e_1^{(k+2)} \otimes N^\theta \otimes N^\theta]$ .

The  $k$ -dimensional quadratic polynomial  $g^\theta$  solves the Poisson equation  $f^\theta = \bar{P}_\theta g^\theta - g^\theta$  (see the proof of Theorem 5.11), where  $\bar{P}_\theta$  denotes the transition operator of  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  under  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$  and where  $f^\theta$  given in equation (3.6) is the  $k$ -dimensional quadratic polynomial that captures the dependence of  $Z^\theta(t, t-1)$  on  $\bar{X}^\theta(t)$  but with limiting coefficients instead of time-dependent ones. Note that  $\bar{A}^\theta$  and  $\bar{a}^\theta$  are the state transition matrix resp. vector for  $\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}$  and  $\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta, \bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^\theta$  are the ones for  $\text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}})$ , in line with the notation in Corollary 5.5, Remark 5.7, and Lemma 5.10. Let  $\alpha_f^\theta$  and  $\beta_f^\theta$  denote a pair of coefficients for  $f^\theta$ . From equation (3.1) it is apparent that  $f^\theta(x)_j = x^\top \Gamma_\theta^{(j)} x + (\beta_f^\theta)_j$ , i.e.  $f^\theta(x)_j = \text{vec}(\Gamma_\theta^{(j)})(x \otimes x) + (\beta_f^\theta)_j$ . Hence  $f^\theta(x) = \Gamma^\theta(x \otimes x) + \beta_f$ , so  $\alpha_f^\theta = (0 \mid \Gamma^\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (k+2)d + (k+2)^2 d^2}$ . The proof of Lemma 5.10 yields  $\alpha_g^\theta = \alpha_f^\theta (\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta - \text{I})^{-1}$ . By writing

$$\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t) \otimes \bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t) = \bar{a}^\theta \otimes \bar{a}^\theta + (\bar{A}^\theta \otimes \bar{A}^\theta)(\bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t) \otimes \bar{X}^{\theta, \text{hom}}(t)) + \bar{a}^\theta \otimes \bar{A}^\theta + \bar{A}^\theta \otimes \bar{a}^\theta + \bar{N}^\theta(t) \otimes \bar{N}^\theta(t)$$

and inserting in the definition of the matrices  $\bar{Q}_{\otimes 2}^\theta, \bar{Q}^\theta$  and the vector  $\bar{q}^\theta$ , we obtain the expressions (3.4). By Remark 5.7 it follows once more that  $\rho(O_\theta) < 1$ . Note that

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} A^{-1} & 0 \\ -D^{-1}CA^{-1} & D^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for any block matrix such that  $A$  and  $D$  are invertible, see Bernstein [18, Proposition 3.9.7]. Applying this formula to  $(\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta - \text{I})^{-1}$ , the given expression for  $\alpha_g^\theta = (0 \mid \Gamma^\theta)(\bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta - \text{I})^{-1}$  follows. Now set  $h^\theta = \bar{P}_\theta g^\theta$ . Since  $\bar{P}_\theta \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x) = \bar{A}_{\otimes 2}^\theta \text{vec}_{\otimes 2}(x) + \bar{a}_{\otimes 2}^\theta$ , the given expressions for  $\alpha_h^\theta$  and  $\beta_h^\theta$  also follow. Corollary 5.12 yields that  $U_\vartheta$  is the limit in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability of  $\widehat{U}_t[\vartheta]$ , where

$$\widehat{U}_t[\vartheta] = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t \left[ g^\vartheta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s)) g^\theta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s))^\top - h^\theta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s)) h^\theta(\bar{X}^\vartheta(s))^\top \right]. \quad (5.34)$$

To prove that the matrix  $U_\vartheta$  is also the limit in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability of the expression (3.5), it remains to show that  $U_\vartheta$  is also the limit of  $\widehat{U}_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)]$  in place of  $\widehat{U}_t[\vartheta]$ . We can decompose

$$\|U_t[\widehat{\theta}(t)] - \widehat{U}_t[\vartheta]\| \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\widehat{U}_t[\theta] - U_\theta\| + \|U_{\widehat{\theta}(t)} - U_\vartheta\|. \quad (5.35)$$

Since each summand in the definition (5.34) of  $\widehat{U}_t[\theta]$  is a  $(k \times k)$ -dimensional polynomial of order 4 in  $\bar{X}^\theta(s)$ , Lemma 5.15 shows that the first summand on the right of (5.35) converges to 0 in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability. And since  $U_\theta$  is continuous in  $\theta$  by the final statement in Corollary 5.13, the second summand also converges to 0 in  $\mathbb{P}$ -probability as  $(\widehat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is  $\vartheta$ -consistent.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.11.* The first statement is (5.19). The representation of  $W(\vartheta)$  follows from how it is introduced in the proof of Proposition 5.16.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.13.*  $W(\theta), U(\theta)$  and  $V_\theta$  are continuous by Proposition 5.16 and by the continuity statement in Corollary 5.13. Since  $(\widehat{\theta}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is  $\vartheta$ -consistent, the first claim follows from the continuous mapping theorem. The second follows from Slutsky's theorem.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.14.* For the Wald test statistic, note that since  $\sqrt{t}(\widehat{\theta}(t) - \vartheta) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} N(0, V_\vartheta)$ , one obtains that  $\sqrt{t}[R(\widehat{\theta}(t)) - R(\vartheta)] \stackrel{H_0}{=} \sqrt{t}[R(\widehat{\theta}(t)) - r] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} N(0, \nabla_\theta R(\vartheta) V_\vartheta \nabla_\theta R(\vartheta)^\top)$  holds by the Delta method. The conclusion about the limiting distribution of the Wald test statistic hence follows from the continuous mapping theorem and Slutsky's theorem. We now turn to the Lagrange multiplier and likelihood-ratio test. We will denote  $Z_t(\theta) := Z^\theta(t)$  and we will work on the set  $\{\widehat{\theta}(t) \in \text{int}(\Theta)\} \cap \{\widehat{\theta}^c(t) \in \text{int}(\Theta)\} \cap \{\widehat{V}^c(t) \text{ invertible}\}$  whose probability converges to 1 under  $H_0$ . As already noted, the constrained estimator  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t)$  solves the Lagrangian equations  $\frac{1}{t} Z_t(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) = \nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))^\top \widehat{\lambda}(t)$  and  $R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) = r$  together with some  $\mathbb{R}^m$ -valued random variables  $\widehat{\lambda}(t)$ . (The proof of the Lagrange multiplier theorem constructs  $\widehat{\lambda}(t)$  explicitly as a continuous function of  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t)$  using the implicit function theorem, so  $\widehat{\lambda}(t)$  is measurable and adapted.) Using Taylor's theorem we get

$$0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} Z_t(\widehat{\theta}(t)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} Z_t(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) + \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z_t(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) \sqrt{t} [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)] + r(t), \quad (5.36)$$

where the  $j$ -th element of  $r(t)$  is given by  $\frac{1}{2} [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)]^\top \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta^2 Z_t(\xi_t^j) \sqrt{t} [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)]$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and where the (random)  $\xi_t^j$  lies on the line segment between  $\widehat{\theta}(t)$  and  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t)$ . Since Assumption B holds with four times continuous differentiability, a similar argument as in Section 5.2.2 and Lemma 5.15 yields that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta^2 Z_t(\theta) - H_j(\theta)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$  for some continuous  $H_j : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ , and so  $\frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta^2 Z_t(\xi_t^j) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} H_j(\vartheta)$  because both  $\widehat{\theta}(t)$  and  $\widehat{\theta}^c(t)$  are consistent under  $H_0$ . By joint asymptotic normality,  $\sqrt{t} [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)]$  converges in distribution, so  $r(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$ . Then we get  $\sqrt{t} [R(\widehat{\theta}(t)) - r] = \sqrt{t} [R(\widehat{\theta}(t)) - R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))] = \sqrt{t} \nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)] + \widetilde{r}(t)$  with some  $\widetilde{r}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} 0$  by applying Taylor's theorem. Inserting (5.36), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{t} [R(\widehat{\theta}(t)) - r] &= \nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) \widehat{W}^c(t)^{-1} \left[ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} Z_t(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) - r(t) \right] + \widetilde{r}(t) \\ &= -\nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) \widehat{W}^c(t)^{-1} \sqrt{t} \nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))^\top \widehat{\lambda}(t) + o_{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\frac{1}{t} Z_t(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) = \sqrt{t} \nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))^\top \widehat{\lambda}(t)$  from the Lagrangian equations and where  $o_{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta}(1)$  denotes a shorthand for any random variable converging to 0 in  $\mathbb{P}_\vartheta$ -probability. Thus  $\sqrt{t} \widehat{\lambda}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} N(0, \Sigma_W^{-1} \Sigma_V \Sigma_W^{-1})$ , and accordingly it follows that  $t \widehat{\lambda}(t)^\top \Sigma_{\widehat{W}}^{-1} \Sigma_{\widehat{V}} \Sigma_{\widehat{W}}^{-1} \widehat{\lambda}(t)$  converges in distribution to a  $\chi^2$ -distributed random variable with  $m$  degrees of freedom, where we define  $\Sigma_{\widehat{W}} = \nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) \widehat{W}^c(t)^{-1} \nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))^\top$ . Inserting the Lagrangian equations, the latter is equal to the Lagrange multiplier test statistic  $\xi_{\text{LM}}$ , proving the second claim. For the likelihood ratio test, let  $L_t(\theta)$  stand for  $L^\theta(t)$  and apply Taylor's theorem as before to obtain

$$L_t(\widehat{\theta}^c(t)) = L_t(\widehat{\theta}(t)) + \frac{1}{2} [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)]^\top \nabla_\theta Z_t(\widehat{\theta}(t)) [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)] + o_{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta}(1),$$

so  $\xi_{\text{LR}}(t) = 2 [L_t(\widehat{\theta}(t)) - L_t(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))] = -\sqrt{t} [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)]^\top \frac{1}{t} \nabla_\theta Z_t(\widehat{\theta}(t)) \sqrt{t} [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)] + o_{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta}(1)$ . By (5.36) we have  $\sqrt{t} [\widehat{\theta}(t) - \widehat{\theta}^c(t)] = -\widehat{W}^c(t)^{-1} \nabla_\theta R(\widehat{\theta}^c(t))^\top \sqrt{t} \widehat{\lambda}(t) + o_{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta}(1)$ . Using  $\sqrt{t} \widehat{\lambda}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} \lambda$  with  $\lambda \sim N(0, \Sigma_W^{-1} \Sigma_V \Sigma_W^{-1})$ , this yields further that  $\xi_{\text{LR}}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_\vartheta} \lambda^\top \nabla_\theta R(\vartheta) [-W(\vartheta)]^{-1} \nabla_\theta R(\vartheta)^\top \lambda$ . The result then follows by standard arguments concerning quadratic forms in normal vectors, see for example van der Vaart [110, Lemma 17.1].  $\square$

## 5.4 Proofs for Section 4

*Proof of Proposition 4.3.* We first show that the given  $X$  is a solution to (4.5). Set  $U(t) := e^{-Qt}$  and  $V(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t e^{Qs} dL(s)$ , which implies  $X(t) = U(t)V(t)$ . By the properties of the matrix exponential, we have  $dU(t) = -QU(t) dt = -U(t)Q dt$ . Integration by parts yields  $dX(t) = dU(t)V(t) + U(t)dV(t)$  because  $U$  is of finite variation. Thus  $dX(t) = -QX(t)dt + dL(t)$ , which shows that  $X$  solves (4.5).

Now, let  $X$  instead be any solution to (4.5) and  $U(t) = e^{Qt}$ . Then  $d(UX)(t) = U(t)QX(t)dt - U(t)QX(t) dt + U(t) dL(t) = U(t) dL(t)$  follows from integration by parts. This implies that  $e^{Qt}X(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t e^{Qs} dL(s)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.4.* Fix  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . By Theorem A.23 there exists some  $c_p > 0$  such that  $\left\| \int_0^t e^{Qs} dL(s) \right\|_{L^p} \leq \left\| \int e^{Q \cdot \text{id}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]} dL \right\|_{S^p} \leq c_p \left\| \int e^{Q \cdot \text{id}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]} dL \right\|_{H^p}$ . Let  $L = M^L + A^L$  be the special semimartingale decomposition of  $L$  into the local martingale part  $M^L$  and the predictable part  $A^L$  of finite variation with  $M^L(0) = A^L(0) = 0$ . Note that  $A^L(t) = a^L t$  almost surely for  $a^L = \mathbb{E}[L(1)]$ , see Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Theorem 2.21]. Using Émery's inequality from Theorem A.24 as well as the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality from Theorem A.22, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^t e^{Qs} dL(s) \right\|_{L^p}^p &\leq c \left\| \int e^{Q \cdot \text{id}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]} dL \right\|_{H^p}^p \leq c \left\| e^{Q \cdot \text{id}} \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]} \right\|_{S^\infty}^p \left\| L \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[0,t]} \right\|_{H^p}^p \\ &\leq c \left( \sup_{s \leq t} \|e^{Qs}\|^p \right) \left\| [M^L, M^L](t) \right\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|A^L(t)\|_{L^p}^p \\ &\leq c \left[ \mathbb{E} \left( \left\| [M^L, M^L](t) \right\|_{L^p}^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) + \mathbb{E} \left( \|A^L(t)\|^p \right) \right] \\ &\leq c \left[ \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \leq t} \|M^L(s)\|^p \right) + \|a^L\|^p t^p \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the constant  $c$  may vary from term to term. Since  $M^L(t) = L(t) - a^L t$ , we have that the term  $\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \leq t} \|M^L(s)\|^p \right)$  is finite iff  $\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \leq t} \|L(s)\|^p \right) < \infty$ . Applying Theorem 25.18 from Sato [95] to the submultiplicative function  $x \mapsto (\|x\| \vee 1)^p$ , this is equivalent to  $\mathbb{E} \left( \|L(1)\|^p \right) < \infty$ , which proves  $\mathbb{E} \left( \left\| \int_0^t e^{Qs} dL(s) \right\|_{L^p}^p \right) < \infty$ . Together with Proposition 4.3 this implies the first claim. For the second suppose that  $\alpha(Q) > 0$  and define  $M_j := \int_j^{j+1} e^{Q(s-j)} dL(s)$ . By the just proven fact and since  $L$  is a Lévy process,  $M_j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  are independent and identically distributed random variables with  $\mathbb{E}(\|M_0\|^p) < \infty$ . This yields

$$\left\| \int_0^t e^{-Q(t-s)} dL(s) \right\|_{L^p} = \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} e^{-Q(t-j)} M_j \right\|_{L^p} \leq \|M_0\|_{L^p} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \|e^{-Q(t-j)}\| = \|M_0\|_{L^p} \sum_{j=1}^t \|e^{-Qj}\|.$$

Elementary properties of the matrix exponential show that  $\rho(e^{-Q}) < 1$  if  $\alpha(Q) > 0$ . By Corollary A.8 we conclude that  $\|e^{-Qj}\| \rightarrow 0$  at a geometric rate. A fortiori, the sum on the right hand side above is bounded in  $t$ , which proves that  $X$  is bounded in  $L^p$  by using the explicit representation of  $X$  from Proposition 4.3.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.5.* Since  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t)) = \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0)) + a_\theta^L t - \int_0^t Q^\theta \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(s)) ds$ , we obtain that  $\mu^\theta(t) := \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t))$  satisfies the ordinary differential equation  $\frac{d}{dt} \mu^\theta(t) = a_\theta^L - Q^\theta \mu^\theta(t)$  together with  $\mu^\theta(0) = \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0))$ . It follows easily from the properties of the matrix exponential that the unique solution to this initial value problem is given by  $\mu^\theta(t) = e^{-Q^\theta t} \mu^\theta(0) + (I_d - e^{-Q^\theta t}) \mu^\theta(\infty)$ ,

from which the expressions for  $A^\theta$  and  $a^\theta$  follow. To derive (4.7), we first search for an expression for  $S^\theta(t) := \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t)X(t)^\top)$ . Integration by parts for matrix-valued semimartingales yields

$$d(X(t)X(t)^\top) = -\text{Sym}(Q^\theta X(t)X(t)^\top) dt + X(t) dL(t)^\top + dL(t)X(t)^\top + d[L, L](t). \quad (5.37)$$

As in Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Example 3.3], one has  $\mathbb{E}_\theta([L, L](t)) = \text{Cov}_\theta(L(t)) = c_\theta^L t$ . Moreover, the stochastic integrals in (5.37) are of the form  $\int_0^t dL(s)X(s)^\top = a_\theta^L \int_0^t X(s)^\top ds + \int_0^t d\tilde{L}^\theta(s)X(s)^\top$ , where  $\tilde{L}^\theta(t) = L(t) - a_\theta^L t$  is a centred Lévy process under  $\mathbb{P}_\theta$  and hence a martingale with finite second moments by the integrability assumption and by Eberlein and Kallsen [44, Theorem 2.21]. It follows from Jacod and Shiryaev [69, Theorem III.6.4(d)] that the process  $\int d\tilde{L}^\theta X^\top$  is a square-integrable martingale on any interval  $[0, t]$  with  $t \geq 0$  because  $X(t)$  has finite second moments for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  by Proposition 4.4, and so  $\mathbb{E}_\theta(\int_0^t dL(s)X(s)^\top) = a_\theta^L \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_\theta[X(s)]^\top ds$ . It follows that  $S^\theta$  satisfies the matrix-valued initial value problem

$$\frac{d}{dt} S^\theta(t) = \text{Sym}[a_\theta^L \mu^\theta(t)^\top - Q^\theta S^\theta(t)] + c_\theta^L$$

with  $S^\theta(0) = \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(0)X(0)^\top)$ . This matrix-valued Sylvester equation can be solved using the results in Fausett [50] to yield

$$S^\theta(t) = e^{-Q^\theta t} S^\theta(0) e^{-Q^{\theta^\top} t} + \int_0^t e^{-Q^\theta(t-s)} [\text{Sym}(a_\theta^L \mu^\theta(s)^\top) + c_\theta^L] e^{-Q^{\theta^\top}(t-s)} ds.$$

Using the fact that  $M(t) := \int_0^t e^{As} C e^{Bs} ds$  satisfies the equation  $e^{At} C e^{Bt} = AM(t) + M(t)B + C$  for any square matrices  $A, B$  and  $C$ , it is then possible to write down a closed-form expression for  $S^\theta$  involving the Kronecker sum and product. To obtain (4.7), one just needs to simplify the expression  $C^\theta(t) = S^\theta(t) - A^\theta S^\theta(t) A^{\theta^\top} - \text{Sym}[A^\theta \mu^\theta(t) a^{\theta^\top}] - a^\theta a^{\theta^\top}$ , which follows easily from expanding the definition of  $C^\theta(t) = \text{Cov}_\theta[X(t) - \mathbb{E}_\theta(X(t) | X(t-1))]$ .  $\square$

## A Tools

### A.1 Ergodic theorems for Markov chains

This section provides a quick overview over some notions from the ergodic theory of discrete-time Markov chains that are needed for the proof of the ergodicity propositions 2.12 and 5.6 as well as for the proof of the geometric ergodicity property 5.22. This appendix closely follows the standard work of Meyn and Tweedie [85]. For the course of this section,  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  denotes a Markov chain with values in  $E$ , where  $(E, \mathcal{E})$  is a measurable space with countably generated  $\sigma$ -algebra, and  $P(x, \cdot) = P_1(x, \cdot)$  stands for the one-step transition measures of  $X$ ,  $x \in E$ , that fully determine the transition semigroup  $(P_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ , which is connected to  $X$  via  $\mathbb{E}(f(X(s+t)) | \mathcal{F}_s) = (P_t f)(X(s))$  for all  $s, t \in \mathbb{N}$  and bounded, measurable  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . As usual, we use the slightly ambiguous notation  $P_t(x, A) := (P_t 1_A)(x) = \mathbb{P}_x(X(t) \in A)$  for the  $t$ -step transition function, where  $\mathbb{P}_\nu$  denotes the measure under which  $X(0) \sim \nu$  and  $\mathbb{P}_x := \mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon(x)}$  for  $x \in E$ . We first define the necessary notions for the following ergodicity theorems.

$X$  is called **irreducible** with respect to a non-trivial measure  $\varphi$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  if, for all  $x \in E$  and all  $A \in \mathcal{E}$  with  $\varphi(A) > 0$ , there exists some  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $P_t(x, A) > 0$ . If  $X$  is irreducible



with respect to some measure  $\varphi$ , Meyn and Tweedie [85, Proposition 4.2.2] yields that there exists some probability measure  $\psi$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  such that, for any other measure  $\varphi'$ ,  $X$  is irreducible with respect to  $\varphi'$  if and only if  $\varphi'$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\psi$ . In this case  $\psi$  is termed a **maximal irreducibility measure** for  $X$  and  $X$  is simply called  **$\psi$ -irreducible**.

If  $X$  is a  $\psi$ -irreducible Markov chain, then there exists some  $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and disjoint sets  $D_1, \dots, D_k \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\psi\left[\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k D_i\right)^c\right] = 0$  and  $P(x, D_{i+1}) = 1$  for any  $x \in D_i$  and  $i = 0, \dots, k-1 \pmod{k}$ , see Meyn and Tweedie [85, Theorem 5.4.4].  $D_1, \dots, D_k$  is termed a  **$k$ -cycle** for  $X$ . If  $k = 1$  is the only integer for which there exists a  $k$ -cycle for  $X$ , then  $X$  is termed **aperiodic**.

In line with the Feller property for continuous-time Markov processes we define a weak Feller property for discrete-time Markov chains. From now on, suppose that  $E$  is equipped with a locally compact, separable and metrisable topology and that  $\mathcal{E}$  is the corresponding Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Then  $X$  is called a **weak Feller chain** if  $P(x, \cdot) \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow x_0} P(x_0, \cdot)$  weakly for all  $x_0 \in E$ , see also Proposition 6.1.1 in Meyn and Tweedie [85]. A set  $A \in \mathcal{E}$  is called **petite** if there exists some non-trivial measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$  with  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n = 1$  such that  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_n P_n(x, B) \geq \nu(B)$  holds for all  $x \in A$  and all  $B \in \mathcal{E}$ . The Markov chain  $X$  is called **bounded in probability on average** if for each  $x \in X$  the sequence  $(\bar{P}_n(x, \cdot))_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is tight, where  $\bar{P}_n(x, \cdot) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n P_k(x, \cdot)$ . If  $X$  is  $\psi$ -irreducible, we call  $X$  a  **$T$ -chain** if any compact subset of  $E$  is petite, see Theorem 6.2.5 in Meyn and Tweedie [85].

The notion of  $\psi$ -irreducibility of a Markov chain entails the behaviour that any set in the support of  $\psi$  is visited with positive probability at some future point in time. The property of **Harris recurrence** strengthens this condition by defining that a  $\psi$ -irreducible Markov chain  $X$  is called Harris recurrent if  $\mathbb{P}_x(X \in A \text{ infinitely often}) = 1$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{E}$  with  $\psi(A) > 0$  and any  $x \in A$ . Additionally, we call a Harris recurrent Markov chain  $X$  **positive Harris** if it admits an invariant probability measure.

Using the above concepts we are now ready to cite the proof of an ergodicity theorem for  $L^p$ -bounded Markov chains, which forms the basis of any ergodicity proof in Section 2. In order to do so, we further restrict the choice of state spaces  $E$  to closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**Theorem A.1.** *Let  $X$  be an  $E$ -valued  $\psi$ -irreducible, aperiodic weak Feller chain such that  $\text{supp}(\psi)$  has non-empty interior. If  $X$  is bounded in  $L^p$  for some  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , there exists a unique stationary distribution  $\mu$  for  $X$ . Moreover,  $X$  is strongly  $f$ -ergodic with respect to  $\mu$  under any  $\mathbb{P}_\nu$  and*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x[f(X(t))] = \int f \, d\mu \quad \text{for } \psi\text{-almost every } x \in E$$

holds for any  $\mu$ -integrable  $f$ . If  $(\mathbb{E}_x[f(X(t))])_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded for some  $x$ , then  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable.

*Proof.* To show that there exists an invariant probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{E}$ , it suffices to verify that the distributions of  $X$  under any  $\mathbb{P}_x$  are tight, i.e. for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any  $x \in E$  there exists a compact  $C \subseteq E$  such that  $\limsup_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{P}_x(X(t) \notin C) \leq \varepsilon$ . Indeed, then  $X$  is bounded in probability on average, and any weak Feller chain bounded in probability on average admits an invariant probability measure, see Meyn and Tweedie [85, Theorem 12.1.2(ii)]. Since  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and any compact set in the relative topology on  $E$  is also compact in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , it suffices to show that  $\limsup_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{P}_x(\|X(t)\| \geq M)$  converges to 0 as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . But

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_x(\|X(t)\| \geq M) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_x(\|X(t)\|^p)}{M^p} \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

by Markov's inequality because  $X$  is bounded in  $L^p$ . Moreover,  $X$  is Harris-recurrent. To wit, note that  $X$  is a  $\psi$ -irreducible T-chain, which follows from Theorem 6.0.1(iii) of Meyn and Tweedie [85] because  $\text{supp}(\psi)$  has non-empty interior. Moreover,  $\mathbb{P}_x(\|X(t)\| \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} \infty) = 0$  for any  $x \in E$  because otherwise  $X$  could not be  $L^p$ -bounded by Fatou's lemma. Theorem 9.0.2 in Meyn and Tweedie [85] then yields that  $X$  is Harris-recurrent.

Together with the already shown properties, this yields that  $X$  is an aperiodic positive Harris chain. In particular, Theorems 13.3.3, 14.0.1, and 17.0.1 in Meyn and Tweedie [85] yield, for any  $\mu$ -integrable function<sup>5</sup>  $f$ , that  $\mathbb{P}_\nu^{X(t)} \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  and  $\frac{1}{t} \sum_{s=1}^t f(X(s)) \rightarrow \int g \, d\mu$  almost surely under any measure  $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_x[f(X(t))] \rightarrow \int f \, d\mu$  for  $\psi$ -almost all  $x \in E$ . If  $f$  is such that the above sequence of expectations is bounded for some  $x \in E$ , Theorem 14.3.3(i) in Meyn and Tweedie [85] yields moreover that the function  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable.  $\square$

**Remark A.2.** Theorem 13.3.3 in Meyn and Tweedie [85], which yields the weak convergence  $\mathbb{P}_\nu^{X(t)} \xrightarrow{w} \mu$  in the above proof, also yields the stronger result that  $\mathbb{P}_\nu^{X(t)}$  converges to  $\mu$  with respect to the total variation norm. Since we do not need this stronger concept of convergence with respect to the total variation norm, we confine ourselves to weak convergence as in Theorem A.1.

We end this section with the well-known Foster–Lyapunov sufficient condition for the concept of *geometric ergodicity* of a Markov chain  $X$  in the following sense:

**Definition A.3.** Define  $\|v\|_f := \sup\{|\int g \, dv| : g \text{ measurable with } g \leq f\}$  for any signed measure  $v$  on  $\mathcal{E}$ , where  $f : E \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  is measurable. A Markov chain  $X$  with semigroup  $(P_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  and invariant measure  $\mu$  is  **$f$ -geometrically ergodic** if there are  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  with

$$\|P_t(x, \cdot) - \mu\|_f \leq cf(x)\gamma^t.$$

We need the following result in the context of an identifiability condition in Section 5.2.3.

**Theorem A.4.** Let  $X$  be an  $E$ -valued  $\psi$ -irreducible, aperiodic weak Feller chain with transition operator  $P$  and unique invariant probability measure  $\mu$  such that  $\text{supp}(\psi)$  has non-empty interior. Then  $X$  is  $f$ -geometrically ergodic for any measurable  $f : E \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  fulfilling the Foster–Lyapunov condition  $Pf - f \leq \beta f + b\mathbb{1}_C$  with some compact  $C \subseteq E$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\beta < 0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $X$  is a  $\psi$ -irreducible weak Feller chain such that  $\text{supp}(\psi)$  has non-empty interior, Proposition 6.2.8 in Meyn and Tweedie [85] implies that  $X$  is a  $\psi$ -irreducible T-chain, i.e. every compact set  $C \subseteq E$  is petite. The remaining part of the theorem follows then from Meyn and Tweedie [85, Theorem 15.0.1].  $\square$

## A.2 Results from matrix analysis and linear systems theory

In this section we provide several useful results from linear algebra, matrix analysis, and dynamic linear systems theory. The most important result proved in this appendix is the stability lemma A.10, which provides (uniform) convergence conditions for linear and Lyapunov-type functional discrete dynamical systems. We start with a simple bound for inverse matrices:

---

<sup>5</sup>Theorem 14.0.1 in Meyn and Tweedie [85] yields convergence of expectations only for  $\mu$ -integrable functions  $f \geq 1$ . This however poses no problem by considering positive and negative parts and shifting.

**Lemma A.5.** Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be a non-singular matrix. Then  $\|A^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\|A\|^{d-1}}{|\det(A)|}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_d$  denote the singular values of  $A$  in decreasing order and recall that this implies  $|\det(A)| = \prod_{k=1}^d \sigma_k$ , that  $\|A\| = \sigma_1$ , and that  $\|A^{-1}\|^{-1} = \sigma_d$ . Then

$$\|A^{-1}\| = \sigma_d^{-1} \leq \sigma_d^{-1} \left( \prod_{k=1}^{d-1} \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_k} \right) = \frac{\sigma_1^{d-1}}{\prod_{k=1}^d \sigma_k} = \frac{\|A\|^{d-1}}{|\det(A)|}. \quad \square$$

The main content of the following lemmata consists in the fact that powers of a matrix  $A$  converge geometrically fast to 0 whenever its spectral radius  $\rho(A)$  is strictly smaller than 1. This basic result extends even to uniform convergence of matrix-valued functions.

**Lemma A.6.** Let  $E$  be a set and  $A : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  bounded with  $\rho(A(x)) \leq \alpha < 1$  for all  $x \in E$ . Then  $A^m \rightarrow 0$  uniformly at a geometric rate, i.e. there are  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that

$$\sup_{x \in E} \|A(x)^m\| \leq c\gamma^m, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

*Proof.* Fix some constant  $C$  such that  $\|A(x)\| \leq C$  for all  $x \in E$  and some  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1-\alpha}{C}$ . In Green [61, Corollary 3.3.2] it is shown that  $\left[ \|B^m\|^{\frac{1}{m}} - \rho(B) \right] / \|B\|$  converges to 0 uniformly in  $0 \neq B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ . Hence we can find  $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that for all  $m \geq N$  and all  $x \in E$  we have

$$\|A(x)^m\|^{\frac{1}{m}} < \rho(A(x)) + \varepsilon \|A(x)\| \leq \alpha + C\varepsilon =: \gamma < 1.$$

for all  $x \in E$ . In particular,  $\|A(x)^m\| < \gamma^m$  for all  $x \in E$  and  $m \geq N$ . By defining the constant  $c := \max \left\{ 1, \gamma^{-N} \max_{1 \leq n \leq N} \sup_{x \in E} \|A(x)^n\| \right\}$ , we obtain the desired result for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ .  $\square$

We can extend the preceding result to uniform convergence on compacta of products of matrix-valued functions which converge to a matrix-valued function fulfilling the assumptions of Lemma A.6 if it is additionally assumed that this limiting function is continuous.

**Lemma A.7.** Let  $E$  be a compact space and suppose that  $A_t : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is bounded for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Suppose also that  $A : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is a continuous function with  $\rho(A(x)) < 1$  for all  $x \in E$  and such that  $A_t \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} A$  uniformly on  $E$ . Then all chains in  $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  converge uniformly at a geometric rate to 0, i.e. there exist some constants  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that

$$\sup_{x \in E} \|A_{s+m}(x)A_{s+m-1}(x) \dots A_{s+1}(x)\| \leq c\gamma^m$$

for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . In particular,  $A^m \rightarrow 0$  uniformly on  $E$  at a geometric rate.

*Proof.* Since  $A$  is continuous, since the spectral radius is a continuous function on  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , and since  $E$  is compact, there exists some  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\rho(A(x)) < \alpha$  for all  $x \in E$ . It follows from Horn and Johnson [65, Lemma 5.6.10] that, for any  $x \in E$ , there exists a matrix norm  $\|\cdot\|_x$  such that  $\|A(x)\|_x < \alpha$ . Then  $D_x := \{y \in E : \|A(y)\|_x < \alpha\}$  is open and, since  $x \in D_x$ ,  $\bigcup_{x \in E} D_x$  is an open cover of  $E$ . By compactness of  $E$  there exists a finite subcover  $E = \bigcup_{k=1}^K D_{x_k}$  for some  $x_1, \dots, x_K \in E$  and some  $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . In other words, for any  $x \in E$  there exists a  $k(x) \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  such that  $\|A(x)\|_{k(x)} := \|A(x)\|_{x_{k(x)}} < \alpha$ . Now fix some  $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \alpha$ . By uniform convergence we deduce that for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  there is  $N(k) \in \mathbb{N}^*$

such that  $\sup_{x \in E} \|A_n(x) - A(x)\|_k < \varepsilon$  for all  $n \geq N(k)$ . Let  $N := \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} N(k)$ . Then

$$\|A_n(x)\|_{k(x)} \leq \|A(x)\|_{k(x)} + \|A_n(x) - A(x)\|_{k(x)} < \alpha + \varepsilon =: \gamma < 1$$

for all  $n \geq N$  and all  $x \in E$ . Now let  $\|\cdot\|$  again denote the spectral norm. By the equivalence of norms on  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , there exist  $C_1, \dots, C_K \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\|\cdot\| \leq C_k \|\cdot\|_k$ . Then, for any  $n \geq N$ ,

$$\|A_n(x)A_{n-1}(x) \dots A_N(x)\| \leq C_{k(x)} \|A_n(x)\|_{k(x)} \dots \|A_N(x)\|_{k(x)} \leq \underbrace{\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} C_k}_{=: C} \gamma^{n-N+1},$$

where  $x \in E$  is arbitrary. This proves the claim for all chains starting at  $N$  or later. Finally, consider a chain  $A_n(x) \dots A_{N-l}(x)$  of length  $m$  starting at some index  $N - l$  for  $l < N$ . Then

$$\|A_n(x) \dots A_{N-l}(x)\| \leq C \sup_{x \in E} \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} \|A_k(x)\| \gamma^{m-l} \leq C \underbrace{\sup_{x \in E} \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} \|A_k(x)\|}_{=: C'} \gamma^{-N} \gamma^m,$$

where the supremum is finite by boundedness of the functions  $A_k$ . Setting  $c := \max\{C, C'\}$  finishes the proof. The final comment follows by considering the constant sequence  $A_t \equiv A$ .  $\square$

If the compact space  $E$  in the preceding lemma is chosen to be a singleton, the result translates verbatim to ordinary sequences of matrices instead of matrix-valued functions:

**Corollary A.8.** *Suppose that  $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is a sequence of matrices that converges to some  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with  $\rho(A) < 1$ . Then all chains in  $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  converge at a geometric rate to 0, i.e. there exist some constants  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\|A_{s+m}A_{s+m-1} \dots A_{s+1}\| \leq c\gamma^m$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . In particular,  $A^m \rightarrow 0$  at a geometric rate as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .*

Alternatively, we can also uniformly bound partial derivatives of chains of differentiable matrix functions by a geometric rate, as the following corollary of Lemma A.7 shows:

**Corollary A.9.** *Let  $E$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^k$  and suppose that functions  $A_t : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $A : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  as in Lemma A.7 are given such that  $A_t \in C^1(E, \mathbb{R}^{d \times d})$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $\partial_{x_j} A_t(x)$  is bounded uniformly in  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $x \in E$  for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Then there exist constants  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$*

$$\left\| \partial_{x_j} [A_{s+m}(x)A_{s+m-1}(x) \dots A_{s+1}(x)] \right\| \leq c m \gamma^m$$

for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . In particular  $\partial_{x_j} A^m \rightarrow 0$  uniformly on  $E$  at a geometric rate.

*Proof.* Applying integration by parts, we see that  $\partial_{x_j} [A_{s+m}(x)A_{s+m-1}(x) \dots A_{s+1}(x)]$  has the form

$$[\partial_{x_j} A_{s+m}(x)] A_{s+m-1}(x) \dots A_{s+1}(x) + A_{s+m}(x) [\partial_{x_j} A_{s+m-1}(x)] \dots A_{s+1}(x) + \dots + A_{s+m}(x) \dots A_{s+1}(x) [\partial_{x_j} A_{s+1}(x)].$$

If  $M \geq 0$  is chosen such that  $\|\partial_{x_j} A_t(x)\| \leq M$  for all  $x \in E$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , and if  $c \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  are chosen as in Lemma A.7, then  $\|\partial_{x_j} [A_{s+m}(x)A_{s+m-1}(x) \dots A_{s+1}(x)]\| \leq c^2 M m \gamma^{m-1} = (c^2 M \gamma^{-1}) m \gamma^m$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

As already noted we will now state the most important lemma of this appendix concerning (uniform) convergence of linear and Lyapunov type functional discrete dynamical systems:

**Lemma A.10.** *Let  $E$  be a compact space. Suppose that  $A_t : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is bounded for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and uniformly convergent to some continuous function  $A : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  with  $\rho(A(x)) < 1$  for all  $x \in E$ . Moreover, let  $B_t : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $B : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  as well as  $b_t : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $b : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be bounded functions. Consider the following linear dynamical systems:*

$$X_{t+1} = A_t X_t A_t^\top + B_t, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$X_{t+1} = A X_t A^\top + B, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$x_{t+1} = A_t x_t + b_t, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$x_{t+1} = A x_t + b \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ -valued functions  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued functions  $(x_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  on  $E$  such that the initial values  $X_1 : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $x_1 : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  are bounded functions. Then the following statements hold:

1. *If the functions  $(B_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ ,  $B$ ,  $(b_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ , and  $b$  are uniformly bounded on  $E$ , then the respective solutions  $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  and  $(x_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  to (A.1–A.4) are uniformly bounded on  $E$ .*
2. *The systems (A.2) and (A.4) possess unique fixed points  $X^* : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and  $x^* : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ , respectively, and we have  $X_t \rightarrow X^*$  as well as  $x_t \rightarrow x^*$  uniformly on  $E$  at a geometric rate. If  $B$  is pointwise positive (semi-)definite, then  $X^*$  is also pointwise positive (semi-)definite.*
3. *If additionally  $B_t \rightarrow B$  (respectively  $b_t \rightarrow b$ ) and  $A_t \rightarrow A$  uniformly at a geometric rate, then the system (A.1) (respectively (A.3)) converges uniformly at a geometric rate to the fixed point of (A.2) (respectively (A.4)).*

Similar to Corollary A.8, Lemma A.10 has an immediate counterpart for ordinary matrices instead of matrix-valued functions by taking  $E$  to be a singleton, which we omit at this point.

*Proof.* The systems (A.1) and (A.2) can be reduced to (A.3) and (A.4) by vectorisation because e.g.  $\text{vec}(X_{t+1}) = (A \otimes A)\text{vec}(X_t) + \text{vec}(B)$  and because  $\rho(A \otimes A) < 1$  whenever  $\rho(A) < 1$ . Hence, except for the definiteness in 2. it suffices to prove the claims 1.–3. for the vector-valued systems (A.3) and (A.4). Moreover, by taking  $A_t \equiv A$  and  $b_t \equiv b$ , it is sufficient to focus on (A.3). By iterating this system we obtain the closed form solution

$$x_{t+1} = \left( \prod_{s=1}^t A_s \right) x_1 + \sum_{s=1}^t \left( \prod_{r=s+1}^t A_r \right) b_s. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

By Lemma A.7 we can bound the norms of the products in (A.5) such that

$$\|x_{t+1}(x)\| \leq \tilde{c} \gamma^t \|x_1(x)\| + \tilde{c} \sum_{s=1}^t \gamma^{t-s} \|b_s(x)\|, \quad x \in E \quad (\text{A.6})$$

holds for some constants  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ . Since  $b$  is uniformly bounded and since  $x_1$  is also bounded, we obtain  $\|x_{t+1}(x)\| \leq c \gamma^t + c \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \gamma^s$ ,  $x \in E$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , where the right-hand side is independent of  $x$  and bounded in  $t$ . This proves 1.

To show 2. for (A.4), it is easy to see that  $x^* := (I_d - A)^{-1}b$  is the unique fixed point for (A.4). In particular, since  $A$  is continuous and  $\rho(A(x)) < 1$  for all  $x \in E$ , there is  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$  with  $\rho(A(x)) \leq \alpha < 1$  for all  $x \in E$ , i.e.  $\rho(A)$  is uniformly bounded below 1. It follows that the eigenvalues of  $I_d - A$  are uniformly bounded away from 0, which explains why the inverse  $(I_d - A(x))^{-1}$  is well defined for all  $x \in E$ . Moreover, by Lemma A.5 we obtain the bound  $\|(I_d - A(x))^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\|I_d - A(x)\|^{d-1}}{|\det(I_d - A(x))|}$ . Since the eigenvalues of  $I_d - A$  are uniformly bounded away from 0, also  $|\det(I_d - A)|$  is uniformly bounded away from 0. Since  $I_d - A$  is continuous on the compact set  $E$ , it is bounded and so  $(I_d - A)^{-1}$  is also bounded on  $E$ . Similar to (A.5) we have

$$x_{t+1} = A^t x_1 + \left( \sum_{s=1}^t A^{t-s} \right) b = A^t x_1 + (I_d - A)^{-1} (I_d - A^t) b, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

hence  $\|x^*(x) - x_{t+1}(x)\| \leq \|A(x)^t\| \|x_1\| + \|(I_d - A(x))^{-1}\| \|A(x)^t\| \|b\| \leq c \|A(x)^t\|$  for some constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . By Lemma A.6 it follows readily that  $x_t \rightarrow x^*$  uniformly at a geometric rate. By (A.7) we can write  $x^* = \left( \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} A^t \right) b$  for the fixed point of the system (A.4) and  $X^* = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} A^t B A^{t\top}$  for the fixed point of the system (A.2). The last identity proves that  $X^*(x)$  is positive (semi-)definite whenever  $B(x)$  is positive (semi-)definite, which finishes 2.

For 3. find  $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$  as well as  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  such that  $\|b_t(x) - b(x)\| \leq \gamma^t$  and  $\|A_t(x) - A(x)\| \leq \gamma^t$  for some  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Suppose moreover that  $\gamma$  and  $c$  have been chosen large enough for chains in  $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  and powers of  $A$  to converge uniformly to 0 at the geometric rate  $\gamma$  with constant  $c$ , which is guaranteed by Lemma A.7. By slight abuse of notation, the constants  $c, \gamma$  may actually differ from one expression to the next; for example we use estimates of the form  $c\gamma^t \leq c\gamma^t$ . Let  $(x_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  denote the solution to (A.3) and  $(\bar{x}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  the solution to (A.4). Combining (A.5) and (A.7) we obtain

$$x(t+1) - \bar{x}(t+1) = \underbrace{\sum_{s=1}^t \left[ \left( \prod_{r=s+1}^t A_r \right) b_s - A^{t-s} b \right]}_{(1)} + \underbrace{\left( \prod_{s=1}^t A_s \right) x_1 - A^t \bar{x}_1}_{(2)}.$$

We first focus on (1), which can be written as  $\sum_{s=1}^t \left( \prod_{r=s+1}^t A_r - A^{t-s} \right) b_s + \sum_{s=1}^t A^{t-s} (b_s - b)$ . The second sum in this decomposition is bounded in norm by  $c \sum_{s=1}^t \gamma^{t-s} \gamma^s \leq c\gamma^t$  uniformly on  $E$ , which shows that it converges uniformly to 0 at a geometric rate. To deal with the first sum in the decomposition, a telescoping sum argument can be used to deduce

$$\prod_{r=s+1}^t A_r - A^{t-s} = \sum_{r=s+1}^t \left[ A^{t-r} (A_r - A) \prod_{u=s+1}^{r-1} A_u \right].$$

The last product is a chain of length  $r - s - 1$  of the matrices  $A_u$ . The above arguments yield

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \prod_{r=s+1}^t A_r(x) - A^{t-s}(x) \right\| &\leq c\gamma^{t-s-1} \sum_{r=s+1}^t \|A_r(x) - A(x)\| \\ &\leq c\gamma^{t-s-1} (t-s)\gamma^{s+1} \leq c\gamma^t \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

for all  $x \in E$ . Since  $(b_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is uniformly bounded on  $E$  as a uniformly convergent sequence of bounded functions, it follows for the first summand in the decomposition of (1) that

$$\left\| \sum_{s=1}^t \left( \prod_{r=s+1}^t A_r(x) - A^{t-s}(x) \right) b_s(x) \right\| \leq c\gamma^t$$

for all  $x \in E$ , which proves that (1) goes to 0 uniformly on  $E$  at a geometric rate. Finally, it follows immediately from Lemma A.7 that (2) converges also to 0 uniformly at a geometric rate because the initial functions  $x_1$  and  $\bar{x}_1$  are bounded on  $E$ . All in all, we have uniform convergence to 0 of  $x(t) - \bar{x}(t)$  at a geometric rate, which proves claim 3.  $\square$

The following lemma uses the Jordan canonical form to deduce that the convergence  $A^n x \rightarrow 0$  entails that the map that  $A$  induces on  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  has spectral radius less than 1:

**Lemma A.11.** *Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  and let  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $A^n x \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $x \in E$ . Then there exists a matrix  $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that  $\rho(\tilde{A}) < 1$  and  $\tilde{A}x = Ax$  for any  $x \in E$ .*

*Proof.* Fix a basis  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_d\}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $A$  is given in Jordan canonical form  $J$  with respect to that basis, with  $J$  being a complex block diagonal matrix of the form

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} J_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & J_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & J_k \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d} \quad \text{with} \quad J_i = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_i & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_i & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \lambda_i & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \lambda_i \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times d_i}$$

for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , where  $\lambda_i$  are the eigenvalues of  $A$ . Since  $d_i$  denotes the dimension of each Jordan block  $J_i$ , we have  $m_k = d$  for  $m_i = d_1 + \dots + d_i$ . For any  $x \in E$ , fix the representation  $x = k_1(x)v_1 + \dots + k_d(x)v_d$ . Assume now that  $A$  has some eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$  with  $|\lambda_i| \geq 1$ . Since the map  $A^n$  is given by  $J^n$  with respect to the basis  $V$ , it follows that the components  $m_{i-1} + 1, \dots, m_i$  of  $A^n x$  are given by  $J_i^n(k_{m_{i-1}}(x), \dots, k_{m_i}(x))^T$  with respect to the basis  $V$ . Since  $|\lambda_i| \geq 1$ , this can only converge to 0 for all  $x \in E$  if  $k_{m_{i-1}}(x) = \dots = k_{m_i}(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in E$ . In this case the action of  $A$  on any  $x \in E$  is not altered if one replaces the Jordan block  $J_i$  by  $\tilde{J}_i = 0 \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i \times d_i}$ . For any eigenvalue  $\lambda_j$  with  $|\lambda_j| < 1$ , define  $\tilde{J}_j := J_j$ . Let

$$\tilde{J} := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{J}_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{J}_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \tilde{J}_k \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{A} = V\tilde{J}V^{-1}.$$

By construction,  $\rho(\tilde{A}) < 1$  and  $\tilde{A}x = Ax$  for all  $x \in E$ , which finishes the proof.  $\square$

The last theorem we state in this appendix provides an extension of the well-known mean-value theorem from elementary calculus to the case of differentiable matrix-valued functions:

**Theorem A.12.** *Let  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$  be a convex set and suppose that  $F : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is a continuously differentiable matrix-valued function. For arbitrary  $y_1, y_2 \in E$  let  $U(y_1, y_2)$  denote the line segment  $U(y_1, y_2) := \{ty_1 + (1-t)y_2 : t \in [0, 1]\} \subseteq E$ . Then*

$$\|F(y_1) - F(y_2)\| \leq \sqrt{\min\{m, n\}} \sup_{x \in U(y_1, y_2)} \sqrt{\|\partial_{x_1} F(x)\|^2 + \dots + \|\partial_{x_k} F(x)\|^2} \|y_1 - y_2\|$$

for any  $y_1, y_2 \in E$ .

*Proof.* By definition we have  $\|\text{vec}(A)\| = \|A\|_{\text{Frob}}$ , where  $\|A\|_{\text{Frob}}$  denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix. It follows that  $\|F(y_1) - F(y_2)\| \leq \|\text{vec} F(y_1) - \text{vec} F(y_2)\|$  because  $\|\cdot\| \leq \|\cdot\|_{\text{Frob}}$ . By the mean value theorem for vector-valued functions we obtain

$$\|F(y_1) - F(y_2)\| \leq \|\text{vec} F(y_1) - \text{vec} F(y_2)\| \leq \sup_{x \in U(y_1, y_2)} \|\nabla_x \text{vec} F(x)\| \cdot \|y_1 - y_2\|, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where  $\nabla_x \text{vec} F(x)$  denotes the Jacobian matrix of  $\text{vec} F$  at  $x$ . Since the columns of  $\nabla_x \text{vec} F(x)$  are given by  $\partial_{x_j} \text{vec} F(x)$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , it follows for any  $x \in E$  that

$$\|\nabla_x \text{vec} F(x)\| \leq \|\nabla_x \text{vec} F(x)\|_{\text{Frob}} = \sqrt{\|\partial_{x_1} \text{vec} F(x)\|^2 + \dots + \|\partial_{x_k} \text{vec} F(x)\|^2}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

As  $\|A\|_{\text{Frob}} \leq \sqrt{\min\{m, n\}} \|A\|$  for any  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , we have  $\|\partial_{x_j} \text{vec} F(x)\| = \|\text{vec}(\partial_{x_j} F(x))\| = \|\partial_{x_j} F(x)\|_{\text{Frob}} \leq \sqrt{\min\{m, n\}} \|\partial_{x_j} F(x)\|$ . Together with (A.9), (A.10) yields the result.  $\square$

### A.3 Results from probability theory and analysis

This purpose of Appendix A.3 is to collect some technical results from probability theory and from analysis. For this section, we fix a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ .

**Lemma A.13.** *Let  $E$  be a compact metric space and  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a continuous function such that  $f(x^*) = \sup_{x \in E} f(x)$  holds for a unique maximiser  $x^* \in E$ . Let  $\arg \max : C(E, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$  denote the set-valued function which maps any continuous function to the set of its maximisers. If  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is a sequence in  $C(E, \mathbb{R})$  with  $\|f_n - f\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0$  and  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is any sequence in  $E$  such that  $x_n \in \arg \max(f_n)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , then  $x_n \rightarrow x^*$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $E$  is a compact metric space, any sequence in  $E$  has a subsequence converging in  $E$ , and since convergence to some element  $x^*$  in a topological space is equivalent to the fact that any subsequence contains a further subsequence converging to  $x^*$ , it suffices to prove that any convergent subsequence of  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  converges to  $x^*$ . Let  $(x_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  be a subsequence converging to some  $x \in E$ . We need to prove  $x = x^*$ . We can decompose

$$|f(x) - f(x^*)| \leq |f(x) - f_{n_k}(x_{n_k})| + |f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) - f(x^*)| \leq |f(x) - f(x_{n_k})| + \|f_{n_k} - f\|_{\infty} + |f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) - f(x^*)|.$$

The first two summands on the right converge to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  by continuity of  $f$  and by uniform convergence. But also the third summand on the right above converges to 0 because

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) - f(x^*) &\leq f(x_{n_k}) - f(x^*) + \|f_{n_k} - f\|_{\infty} \leq \|f_{n_k} - f\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0, \\ f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) - f(x^*) &\geq f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) - f_{n_k}(x^*) - \|f_{n_k} - f\|_{\infty} \geq -\|f_{n_k} - f\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

and so we obtain  $f(x) = f(x^*)$ , which implies  $x = x^*$  by uniqueness of the maximiser.  $\square$

The following shows that moving averages of  $L^p$ -bounded processes are also  $L^p$ -bounded:

**Lemma A.14.** *Let  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued stochastic process bounded in  $L^p$  for some  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . Let  $E$  be a set and let  $F_s^{(t)} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be functions for each  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $s \in \{0, \dots, t\}$  with  $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{s=0}^t \sup_{x \in E} \|F_s^{(t)}(x)\| < \infty$ . Define processes  $(Y_x(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  by  $Y_x(t) := \sum_{s=0}^t F_s^{(t)}(x) X(t-s)$  for any  $x \in E$ . Then  $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(t)\|^p \right] < \infty$ .*



*Proof.*  $\|M\| := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} \|M_x\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$  defines a norm on the space of all collections  $M = (M_x)_{x \in E}$  of random variables. To wit, we can generalise the Minkowski inequality by the following calculation for  $\|M + N\| \neq 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|M + N\|^p &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} \|M_x + N_x\|^p \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} (\|M_x + N_x\| \cdot \|M_x + N_x\|^{p-1}) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} (\|M_x\| \sup_{x \in E} \|M_x + N_x\|^{p-1}) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} (\|N_x\| \sup_{x \in E} \|M_x + N_x\|^{p-1}) \right] \\ &\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} \|M_x\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} \|N_x\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{x \in E} \|M_x + N_x\|^{p-1} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \right]^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\ &= (\|M\| + \|N\|) \|M + N\|^{p-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Hölder's inequality for the second inequality. This implies that  $\|M + N\| \leq \|M\| + \|N\|$  for  $\|M + N\| \neq 0$ , as desired. Now, we can use the just shown inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(t)\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} \left\| \sum_{s=0}^t F_s^{(t)}(x) X(t-s) \right\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \sum_{s=0}^t \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{x \in E} \|F_s^{(t)}(x) X(t-s)\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq \sum_{s=0}^t \sup_{x \in E} \|F_s^{(t)}(x)\| \mathbb{E} \left[ \|X(t-s)\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|X(t)\|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{s=0}^t \sup_{x \in E} \|F_s^{(t)}(x)\| \end{aligned}$$

for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , where the right side is finite and independent of  $t$ , which finishes the proof.  $\square$

We now prove some elementary auxiliary results about convergence at a geometric rate:

**Lemma A.15.** *Let  $E$  be a unital normed algebra with respect to an inner multiplication operation. Let  $a, b \in E$  and  $(a_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(b_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  be sequences in  $E$  such that  $a_t \rightarrow a$  and  $b_t \rightarrow b$  at a geometric rate. Finally, let  $F$  denote an arbitrary normed space and let  $f : E \rightarrow F$ . Then the following statements hold true:*

1. *We have  $a_t + b_t \rightarrow a + b$  at a geometric rate.*
2. *We have  $a_t b_t \rightarrow ab$  at a geometric rate. In particular, we have that  $a_t^n \rightarrow a^n$  at a geometric rate for  $n$ -th powers with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*
3. *If  $a$  and  $a_t$  are invertible for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $a_t^{-1} \rightarrow a^{-1}$  at a geometric rate.*

*Proof.* 1. This is obvious.

2. This follows from part 2. by decomposing  $a_t b_t - ab = a_t(b_t - b) + (a_t - a)b$  and by noting that the sequence  $(a_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is bounded in  $E$  because it is a convergent sequence.

3. We can decompose  $a_t^{-1} - a^{-1} = a_t^{-1}(a - a_t)a^{-1}$ . Since the map  $x \mapsto x^{-1}$  is continuous on the group of invertible elements of a unital normed algebra, the sequence  $(a_t^{-1})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded in  $E$  because it is convergent. The result then follows upon taking norms.  $\square$

In the following two proofs we write  $\|\cdot\|_p$  for  $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$  for better readability.

**Lemma A.16.** *Let  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued stochastic process that is bounded in  $L^p$  for some  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . If  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  is a  $k$ -dimensional polynomial of order  $q$  for some  $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$  with  $q \leq p$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , then the process  $g(X)$  is bounded in  $L^{\frac{p}{q}}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\|Y\|_p \leq \|Y_1\|_p + \dots + \|Y_k\|_p$  holds for any  $k$ -dimensional random variable  $Y$  and any  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , it suffices to prove that each component of the  $k$ -dimensional process  $g(X)$  is bounded in  $L^{\frac{p}{q}}$ . Hence assume that  $k = 1$  and let the function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be of the form  $g(x) = \sum_{|\lambda| \leq q} \alpha_\lambda x^\lambda$ . Then we obtain that  $\|g(X(t))\|_{\frac{p}{q}} \leq \sum_{|\lambda| \leq q} |\alpha_\lambda| \|X(t)^\lambda\|_{\frac{p}{q}}$ . Thus it suffices to show boundedness in  $L^{\frac{p}{q}}$  of monomials  $X(t)^\lambda$  for  $|\lambda| \geq 1$ , which can be written as  $X(t)^\lambda = \prod_{j=1}^d X_j(t)^{\lambda_j}$ . By Hölder's inequality, we can deduce the bound

$$\mathbb{E}(|X(t)^\lambda|^{\frac{p}{q}}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{j=1}^d |X_j(t)^{\frac{p\lambda_j}{q}}|\right) \leq \prod_{j=1}^d \|X_j(t)^{\frac{p\lambda_j}{q}}\|_{\frac{q|\lambda|}{\lambda_j}} = \prod_{\lambda_j \neq 0} \|X_j(t)^{\frac{p\lambda_j}{q}}\|_{\frac{q|\lambda|}{\lambda_j}}$$

because  $\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\lambda_j}{|\lambda|} = 1$ , where we set  $\frac{|\lambda|}{\lambda_j} := \infty$  whenever  $\lambda_j = 0$ . The last identity follows because all factors with  $\lambda_j = 0$  are equal to 1. For  $\lambda_j \neq 0$  we can bound the remaining factors by

$$\|X_j(t)^{\frac{p\lambda_j}{q}}\|_{\frac{q|\lambda|}{\lambda_j}} = \mathbb{E}(|X_j(t)|^{\frac{p|\lambda|}{q}})^{\frac{\lambda_j}{|\lambda|}} = \|X_j(t)\|_{\frac{p|\lambda|}{q}}^{\frac{p\lambda_j}{q}} \leq \|X_j(t)\|_p^{\frac{p\lambda_j}{q}}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where the last inequality follows from  $|\lambda| \leq q$ . Since  $X$  is  $L^p$ -bounded, this ends the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma A.17.** *Let  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $Y = (Y(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  be  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued stochastic processes such that  $X$  or  $Y$  are bounded in  $L^p$  for some  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . Suppose moreover that  $X(t) - Y(t) \xrightarrow{L^p} 0$  and let  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be any polynomial of order  $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$  with  $q \leq p$ . Then  $g(X(t)) - g(Y(t)) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^{\frac{p}{q}}$ . If the convergence  $X(t) - Y(t) \xrightarrow{L^p} 0$  occurs at a geometric rate of order  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , then also  $g(X(t)) - g(Y(t)) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^{\frac{p}{q}}$  at a geometric rate of order  $r$ .*

*Proof.* First, if one of  $X$  and  $Y$  is bounded in  $L^p$ , then the other one is clearly also bounded in  $L^p$  because their difference converges to 0 in  $L^p$ . By the same reasoning as in Lemma A.16, we can assume that  $k = 1$ . Let the function  $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be again of the form  $g(x) = \sum_{|\lambda| \leq q} \alpha_\lambda x^\lambda$ . As in the proof of Lemma A.16, we have  $\|g(X(t)) - g(Y(t))\|_{\frac{p}{q}} \leq \sum_{|\lambda| \leq q} |\alpha_\lambda| \|X(t)^\lambda - Y(t)^\lambda\|_{\frac{p}{q}}$ ; so it suffices to show the claim for monomials  $g(x) = x^\lambda$  with  $|\lambda| \geq 1$ . Now

$$X(t)^\lambda - Y(t)^\lambda = \prod_{j=1}^d X_j(t)^{\lambda_j} - \prod_{j=1}^d Y_j(t)^{\lambda_j} = \sum_{j=1}^d \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} X_i(t)^{\lambda_i} (X_j(t)^{\lambda_j} - Y_j(t)^{\lambda_j}) \prod_{i=j+1}^d Y_i(t)^{\lambda_i} \right]$$

for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consequently, the triangle inequality for any  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  yields that

$$\|X(t)^\lambda - Y(t)^\lambda\|_{\frac{p}{q}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \left\| \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} X_i(t)^{\lambda_i} (X_j(t)^{\lambda_j} - Y_j(t)^{\lambda_j}) \prod_{i=j+1}^d Y_i(t)^{\lambda_i} \right\|_{\frac{p}{q}}.$$

By Hölder's inequality, since  $\sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\lambda_j}{|\lambda|} = 1$ , and using the convention  $\frac{1}{0} := \infty$ , it follows that we can bound the  $j$ -th summand on the right-hand side of the preceding inequality by the term

$$\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \|X_i(t)^{\frac{p\lambda_i}{q}}\|_{\frac{q|\lambda|}{\lambda_i}}^{\frac{q}{p}} \|(X_j(t)^{\lambda_j} - Y_j(t)^{\lambda_j})\|_{\frac{p|\lambda|}{\lambda_j}}^{\frac{q}{p}} \prod_{i=j+1}^d \|Y_i(t)^{\frac{p\lambda_i}{q}}\|_{\frac{q|\lambda|}{\lambda_i}}^{\frac{q}{p}}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Focus first on the products on the left side of (A.12). Each factor  $\|X_i(t)^{\frac{p\lambda_i}{q}}\|_{\frac{q|\lambda|}{\lambda_i}}$  is uniformly bounded in  $t$  by the same reasoning as in (A.11). Likewise, the whole product on the right-hand side of (A.12) is uniformly bounded in  $t$ . Since  $|\lambda| \leq q$ , the middle term in (A.12) is bounded by

$$\|(X_j(t)^{\lambda_j} - Y_j(t)^{\lambda_j})\|_{\frac{p|\lambda|}{\lambda_j}}^{\frac{q}{p}} \leq \|(X_j(t)^{\lambda_j} - Y_j(t)^{\lambda_j})\|_{\frac{p}{\lambda_j}}^{\frac{q}{p}} = \|X_j(t)^{\lambda_j} - Y_j(t)^{\lambda_j}\|_{\frac{p}{\lambda_j}}.$$

If  $\lambda_j = 0$ , this term is equal to 1. Otherwise, we can write  $x^n - y^n = (x - y) \sum_{j=1}^n x^{n-j} y^{j-1}$  for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . We now apply Hölder's inequality in the form  $\|fg\|_r \leq \|f\|_{rk} \|g\|_{rl}$ , which holds for any  $r \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{l} = 1$ , to  $r := \frac{p}{\lambda_j}$ ,  $k := \lambda_j$  and  $l := \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - 1}$ . This gives

$$\|X_j(t)^{\lambda_j} - Y_j(t)^{\lambda_j}\|_{\frac{p}{\lambda_j}} \leq \|X_j(t) - Y_j(t)\|_p \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda_j} X_j(t)^{\lambda_j-i} Y_j(t)^{i-1} \right\|_{\frac{p}{\lambda_j-1}}. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

The sum on the right-hand side is a polynomial of order  $\lambda_j - 1$  of the  $2d$ -dimensional process  $(X, Y)$ , which is bounded in  $L^p$ . Lemma A.16 hence yields that this polynomial is bounded in  $L^{\frac{p}{\lambda_j-1}}$ . Since moreover  $\|X_j(t) - Y_j(t)\|_p \leq \|X(t) - Y(t)\|_p$ , we obtain that the left-hand side of (A.13) converges to 0 (at a geometric rate of order  $r$ ) whenever  $X(t) - Y(t) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L^p$  (at a geometric rate of order  $r$ ). This finishes the proof.  $\square$

In the course of Section 5, we need a suitable version of a central limit theorem for discrete-time martingales. There is plenty of literature concerning martingale central limit theorems, see for example Hall and Heyde [62]. Since however most of these results are stated in one dimension, we include a multivariate version of the martingale central limit theorem below:

**Theorem A.18.** *Suppose that, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , a positive integer  $k_n \in \mathbb{N}^*$  as well as some filtration  $\mathcal{F}^{(n)} := (\mathcal{F}_k^{(n)})_{k \in \{0, \dots, k_n\}}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  are given such that  $\mathcal{F}_0^{(n)} := \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$  and  $(U_k^{(n)})_{k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\}}$  is some  $d$ -dimensional square-integrable martingale difference sequence with respect to  $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ , i.e.  $\mathbb{E}(U_{k+1}^{(n)} | \mathcal{F}_k^{(n)}) = 0$  for every  $k \in \{1, \dots, k_n - 1\}$  and each  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Finally, assume that there exists some positive semidefinite matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  such that the following holds:*

1.  $\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}(U_k^{(n)} U_k^{(n)\top} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{(n)}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Sigma$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,
2.  $\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}[\|U_k^{(n)}\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\|U_k^{(n)}\| \geq \varepsilon\}}] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$  for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

Then  $M_n := \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_k^{(n)}$  defines a martingale with  $M_n \xrightarrow{d} Z$ , where  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ . Set  $\widehat{V}_k^{(n)} := \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}[\|U_j^{(n)}\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}^{(n)}]$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\}$ . If the sequence  $(\widehat{V}_{k_n}^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is tight, i.e. if we have  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} > \lambda) \xrightarrow{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} 0$ , then 1. is equivalent to  $\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_k^{(n)} U_k^{(n)\top} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Sigma$ .

*Proof.* Define  $V_k^{(n)} := \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}(U_j^{(n)} U_j^{(n)\top} | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}^{(n)})$ . Then condition 1. reads as  $V_{k_n}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Sigma$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $d = 1$ , the first part of the theorem concerning convergence in distribution follows from Billingsley [21, Theorem 35.12]. Now, let  $t = (t_1, \dots, t_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ , and focus on the one-dimensional martingale difference sequence  $t^\top U_k^{(n)}$ . Since  $V_{k_n}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Sigma$ , one has

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}[t^\top U_k^{(n)} U_k^{(n)\top} t | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{(n)}] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} t^\top \Sigma t.$$

Moreover, since  $|t^\top U_k^{(n)}| \leq \|t\| \|U_k^{(n)}\|$  by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}[|t^\top U_k^{(n)}|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|t^\top U_k^{(n)}| > \varepsilon\}}] \leq \|t\|^2 \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}[\|U_k^{(n)}\|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\|U_k^{(n)}\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{\|t\|}\}}] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

by 2. Thus, the array  $t^\top U_k^{(n)}$  fulfils the conditions 1. and 2. in the case  $d = 1$ , whence  $t^\top M_n \xrightarrow{d} t^\top Z$ . By the Cramér-Wold theorem we then obtain  $M_n \xrightarrow{d} Z$ . For the second part

of the theorem, we follow the lines of the proof of Theorem 2.23 in Hall and Heyde [62]. For convenience let  $W_k^{(n)} := \sum_{j=1}^k U_j^{(n)} U_j^{(n)\top}$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\}$ . By taking  $A_k = \{\|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon\}$  in the notation of Dvoretzky [43, Lemma 3.5], it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\}} \|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon\right) &\leq \eta + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{P}[\|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{(n)}] > \eta\right) \leq \eta + \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{P}(\|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \eta + \frac{1}{\eta \varepsilon^2} \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}[\|U_k^{(n)}\|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\|U_k^{(n)}\| \geq \varepsilon\}}], \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Markov inequality twice. By 2. and since  $\eta$  was arbitrary, we deduce that  $\mathbb{P}(\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\}} \|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Now, let  $\delta > 0$  and  $\lambda > 0$  and define  $\tilde{U}_k^{(n)} = U_k^{(n)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\|U_k^{(n)}\| \leq \varepsilon, \hat{V}_k^{(n)} \leq \lambda\}}$  and  $\tilde{W}_k^{(n)} = \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{U}_j^{(n)} \tilde{U}_j^{(n)\top}$  as well as

$$\tilde{V}_k^{(n)} = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}(\tilde{U}_j^{(n)} \tilde{U}_j^{(n)\top} \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}^{(n)}) = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}[U_j^{(n)} U_j^{(n)\top} \mathbf{1}_{\{\|U_j^{(n)}\| \leq \varepsilon\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{j-1}^{(n)}] \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{V}_j^{(n)} \leq \lambda\}}.$$

On  $\{\hat{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} \leq \lambda\}$  one has  $V_{k_n}^{(n)} - \tilde{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}[U_k^{(n)} U_k^{(n)\top} \mathbf{1}_{\{\|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{(n)}]$  and  $\hat{V}_k^{(n)} \leq \hat{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} \leq \lambda$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\}$ . Hence  $p_n := \mathbb{P}(\{W_{k_n}^{(n)} \neq \tilde{W}_{k_n}^{(n)}\} \cup \{\|V_{k_n}^{(n)} - \tilde{V}_{k_n}^{(n)}\| > \frac{\delta}{2}\})$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\}} \|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon\right) + \mathbb{P}(\hat{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} > \lambda) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}[U_k^{(n)} U_k^{(n)\top} \mathbf{1}_{\{\|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{(n)}]\right\| > \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\}} \|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon\right) + \mathbb{P}(\hat{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} > \lambda) + \frac{2}{\delta} \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}\left[\|U_k^{(n)}\|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\|U_k^{(n)}\| > \varepsilon\}}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where the first and third summand converge to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\|W_{k_n}^{(n)} - V_{k_n}^{(n)}\| > \delta\right) &\leq p_n + \mathbb{P}\left(\|\tilde{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} - \tilde{W}_{k_n}^{(n)}\| > \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \leq p_n + \frac{4\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} - \tilde{W}_{k_n}^{(n)}\|^2]}{\delta^2} \\ &\leq p_n + \frac{4d}{\delta^2} \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\tilde{U}_k^{(n)} \tilde{U}_k^{(n)\top} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{U}_k^{(n)} \tilde{U}_k^{(n)\top} \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{(n)}]\right\|^2\right) \leq p_n + \frac{16d}{\delta^2} \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}(\|\tilde{U}_k^{(n)} \tilde{U}_k^{(n)\top}\|^2) \\ &= p_n + \frac{16d}{\delta^2} \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}(\|\tilde{U}_k^{(n)}\|^4) \leq p_n + \frac{16d\varepsilon^2}{\delta^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{U}_k^{(n)}\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{(n)}]\right) \leq p_n + \frac{16d\varepsilon^2}{\delta^2} \lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

where (A.14) follows because

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\sum_k Y(k)\right\|^2\right) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\left\|\sum_k Y(k)\right\|_{\text{Frob}}^2\right) = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{km} Y_j(k)^\top Y_j(m)\right) = \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_k Y_j(k)^\top Y_j(k)\right) \\ &= \sum_k \mathbb{E}\left(\|Y(k)\|_{\text{Frob}}^2\right) \leq d \sum_k \mathbb{E}\left(\|Y(k)\|^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ -valued martingale difference sequence  $Y$ , due to the orthogonality of martingale increments. Hence, we obtain  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\|W_{k_n}^{(n)} - V_{k_n}^{(n)}\| > \delta) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{V}_{k_n}^{(n)} > \lambda) +$

$\frac{16d\varepsilon^2}{\delta^2}\lambda$ . Upon letting first  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and then  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  it follows that  $W_{k_n}^{(n)} - V_{k_n}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ . This implies that  $W_{k_n}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Sigma$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if condition 1. holds, i.e. if and only if  $V_{k_n}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Sigma$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

The main technical purpose of the following short lemma is to establish an elementary condition under which the uncountable supremum of real-valued random variables is again a well-defined random variable. We make occasional use of this result in Section 5.2.2.

**Lemma A.19.** *Let  $E$  be a separable topological space. Suppose that for each  $x \in E$  a random variable  $Y(x)$  taking values in a normed space  $F$  is given such that for each fixed  $\omega$  the function  $x \mapsto Y(x)(\omega)$  is continuous. Then the function  $\sup_{x \in E} \|Y(x)\|$  is measurable.*

*Proof.* Since  $E$  is separable, there exists a countable dense subset  $E_0 \subseteq E$ . By  $\omega$ -wise continuity in  $x$  we then have  $\sup_{x \in E} \|Y(x)\| = \sup_{x \in E_0} \|Y(x)\|$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the norm in  $F$ . This is measurable as a countable supremum of measurable functions.  $\square$

The next result stated below contains a standard condition for *uniform convergence in probability*, which is often termed a stochastic equicontinuity condition, see for example Andrews [9]. In the context of parameter estimation from Section 3, we need this condition to prove uniform weak laws of large numbers. The stochastic equicontinuity condition is quite old and dates back to Prokhorov [92].

**Theorem A.20.** *Let  $(E, d)$  be a compact metric space and suppose that for each  $x \in E$  a sequence of  $d$ -dimensional random variables  $(Y_x(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  as well as a deterministic  $Y(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are given such that  $Y_x(t)$  and  $Y(x)$  are continuous in  $x$ . Suppose moreover that  $Y_x(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} Y(x)$  for each  $x \in E$  and that for each  $x \in E$  the uniform stochastic equicontinuity condition*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{d(x,y) < \alpha} \|Y_x(t) - Y_y(t)\| > \varepsilon \right) = 0$$

*holds for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $\sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(t) - Y(x)\| \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0$  in probability.*

*Proof.* All suprema over uncountable sets occurring in the theorem are well-defined random variables by Lemma A.19 because  $E$  is separable as a compact space. The proof now closely follows the proof of Theorem 1 in Andrews [9]. Since  $x \mapsto Y(x)$  is continuous on the compact space  $E$ , it is uniformly continuous. Let  $\alpha > 0$  be so small that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{d(x,y) < \alpha} \|Y_x(t) - Y_y(t)\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \right) < \eta$  and that  $\sup_{d(x,y) < \alpha} \|Y(x) - Y(y)\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$  for fixed  $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$ . Using the total boundedness of  $E$  we can find a finite set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_K\} \subseteq E$  such that  $E = \bigcup_{j=1}^K B(x_j, \alpha)$ , where  $B(x_j, \alpha)$  denotes the open ball of radius  $\alpha$  around  $x_j$ , as usual. We then obtain for  $k(\varepsilon) := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(t) - Y(x)\| > \varepsilon \right)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} k(\varepsilon) &\leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \sup_{x \in B(x_j, \alpha)} [\|Y_x(t) - Y_{x_j}(t)\| + \|Y_{x_j}(t) - Y(x_j)\| + \|Y(x_j) - Y(x)\|] > \varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{d(x,y) < \alpha} \|Y_x(t) - Y_y(t)\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \right) + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \|Y_{x_j}(t) - Y(x_j)\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \right) \\ &< \eta + \sum_{j=1}^K \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \|Y_{x_j}(t) - Y(x_j)\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{3K} \right) = \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\eta > 0$  was arbitrary, it follows that  $k(\varepsilon) = 0$ , which finishes the proof.  $\square$

Another result that is needed for the proofs of Section 5.2.3 is given by the following lemma, which states that a sequence of random functions converges uniformly in probability whenever it converges pointwise in probability and its partial derivatives converge uniformly.

**Lemma A.21.** *Let  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be bounded and convex. Suppose that for each  $x \in E$ , a sequence of  $m$ -dimensional random variables  $(Y_x(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is given such that  $Y_x(t)$  is continuously differentiable in  $x$ , and that there exists a deterministic function  $Y : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $Y_x(t) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} Y(x)$  for any  $x \in E$ . Suppose further that there exists some continuous  $W : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  such that  $\sup_{x \in E} \|\nabla_x Y_x(t) - W(x)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ , where  $\nabla_x$  denotes the  $(m \times n)$ -Jacobian matrix with respect to  $x$ . Then  $Y$  is continuously differentiable,  $\sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(t) - Y(x)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ , and  $\nabla_x Y = W$ .*

*Proof.* We first show that  $Y_x(t)$  is a uniform Cauchy sequence in probability, i.e., for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$  there is a  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(s) - Y_x(t)\| > \varepsilon) < \delta$  for all  $s, t \geq T$ . Let  $x_0 \in E$ . By applying the multivariate mean value theorem to  $x \mapsto Y_x(t) - Y_x(s)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(t) - Y_x(s)\| &\leq \sup_{x \in E} \|(Y_x(t) - Y_x(s)) - (Y_{x_0}(t) - Y_{x_0}(s))\| + \|Y_{x_0}(t) - Y_{x_0}(s)\| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in E} \|\nabla_x Y_x(t) - \nabla_x Y_x(s)\| \sup_{x \in E} \|x - x_0\| + \|Y_{x_0}(t) - Y_{x_0}(s)\| \\ &\leq \text{diam}(E) \sup_{x \in E} \|\nabla_x Y_x(t) - \nabla_x Y_x(s)\| + \|Y_{x_0}(t) - Y_{x_0}(s)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\nabla_x Y_x(t) \rightarrow W(x)$  uniformly in probability,  $(\nabla_x Y_x(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is a uniform Cauchy sequence in probability, i.e. for given  $\varepsilon > 0$  we can find some  $T \in \mathbb{N}^*$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{x \in E} \|\nabla_x Y_x(t) - \nabla_x Y_x(s)\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2 \text{diam}(E)}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  for all  $s, t \geq T$ . Likewise, since  $Y_{x_0}(t)$  converges in probability for any  $x_0 \in E$ , it is a Cauchy sequence in probability, so we can choose  $T$  large enough such that also  $\mathbb{P}(\|Y_{x_0}(t) - Y_{x_0}(s)\| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  for all  $s, t \geq T$ . By the mean value theorem, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(t) - Y_x(s)\| > \varepsilon\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in E} \|\nabla_x Y_x(t) - \nabla_x Y_x(s)\| \text{diam}(E) + \|Y_{x_0}(t) - Y_{x_0}(s)\| > \varepsilon\right) \leq \varepsilon$$

for  $s, t \geq T$ , so  $(Y_x(t))_{t \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is uniformly Cauchy in probability. Consequently, there exists some (possibly random) function  $\tilde{Y} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $\sup_{x \in E} \|Y_x(t) - \tilde{Y}(x)\| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ . But by the uniqueness of limits in probability, it follows that  $\tilde{Y} = Y$  almost surely.

Fix now  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . For any  $x \in E$  let  $H_j(x)$  denote the set of all  $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $x' := x + h e_j^{(n)} \in E$ , where  $e_j^{(n)}$  is the  $j$ -th unit vector. Then, for  $x \in E$  and  $h \in H_j(x)$ ,

$$\left| \frac{1}{h} [Y_{x'}(t)_i - Y_x(t)_i] - \frac{1}{h} [Y_{x'}(s)_i - Y_x(s)_i] \right| \leq \sup_{x \in E} |\nabla_x Y_x(t)_{ij} - \nabla_x Y_x(s)_{ij}|,$$

so the quotient sequence is Cauchy in probability uniformly in  $x \in E$  and  $h \in H_j(x)$ . Therefore  $\sup_{x \in E, h \in H_j(x)} \left| \frac{1}{h} [Y_{x'}(t)_i - Y_x(t)_i] - \frac{1}{h} [Y_{x'}(s)_i - Y_x(s)_i] \right| \rightarrow 0$  in probability and in particular almost surely along a subsequence  $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ . Take a further subsequence  $(t_{k_l})_{l \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  such that also  $\sup_{x \in E} \|\nabla_x Y_x(t_{k_l}) - W(x)\| \rightarrow 0$  almost surely. With a slight abuse of notation, we will suppress the indices  $k_l$  of these subsequences in the following. We will now show that  $Y$  is continuously differentiable and  $\nabla_x Y = W$ . For  $x \in E$  and  $x' = x + h e_j$  with  $h \in H_j(x)$  we get

$$\left| \frac{1}{h} [Y(x')_i - Y(x)_i] - W(x)_{ij} \right| \leq A + B + C, \tag{A.15}$$

where  $A = \left| \frac{1}{h} [Y(x')_i - Y(x)_i] - \frac{1}{h} [Y_{x'}(t)_i - Y_x(t)_i] \right|$ ,  $B = \left| \frac{1}{h} [Y_{x'}(t)_i - Y_x(t)_i] - \nabla_x Y_x(t)_{ij} \right|$ , and  $C = \left| \nabla_x Y_x(t)_{ij} - W(x)_{ij} \right|$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the arguments above, the terms  $A$  and  $C$  become almost surely less than  $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$  for some large enough  $t$  independent of  $x$  and  $h$ , while the term  $B$  becomes less than  $\frac{\varepsilon}{3}$  for any fixed  $t$  if  $|h|$  is small enough. It follows that  $\partial_{x_j} Y(x)_i = W(x)_{ij}$ .  $\square$

In Section 4.2 we need multivariate extensions of the well-known Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality (see Dellacherie and Meyer [36, Theorem VII.92]) and of Émery’s inequality (see Protter [93, Theorem V.3]) for semimartingales. These multivariate extensions follow easily from their univariate counterparts, and we include the proofs here for the sake of completeness. In the following, let  $\|M\|_{\max} := \max \{ |M_{ij}| : i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \}$  denote the maximum-element norm of a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and recall that  $\|M\|_{\max} \leq \|M\| \leq \sqrt{mn} \|M\|_{\max}$ , where the latter can be derived from simple relations between the spectral norm and the Frobenius norm of a matrix. We start with the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality and, as always, fix some right-continuous filtration  $(\mathcal{F}(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  on the space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ .

**Theorem A.22.** *Let  $X = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued local martingale with  $X(0) = 0$  and let  $p \in [1, \infty)$ . Then there are positive constants  $c_p$  and  $C_p$  such that for all stopping times<sup>6</sup>  $\tau$*

$$c_p \mathbb{E}(\|[X, X](\tau)\|_{\max}^{\frac{p}{2}}) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \leq \tau} \|X(s)\|^p\right) \leq C_p \mathbb{E}(\|[X, X](\tau)\|_{\max}^{\frac{p}{2}}).$$

*In particular, the constants  $c_p$  and  $C_p$  can be chosen as  $c_p = [6pd^{\frac{p}{2}+1}]^{-1}$  and  $C_p = 4pd^{\frac{p}{2}+1}$ .*

*Proof.* First, note that  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}(X_i) \leq \mathbb{E}(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} X_i) \leq n \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbb{E}(X_i)$  for any nonnegative random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . Moreover, we use the univariate Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality  $\frac{1}{6p} \mathbb{E}(\|[X, X](\tau)\|_{\max}^{\frac{p}{2}}) \leq \mathbb{E}(\sup_{s \leq \tau} |X(s)|^p) \leq 4p \mathbb{E}(\|[X, X](\tau)\|_{\max}^{\frac{p}{2}})$  in the case  $d = 1$ , found e.g. in Dellacherie and Meyer [36, Theorem VII.92]. To show the first inequality, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\|[X, X](\tau)\|_{\max}^{\frac{p}{2}}\right) &\leq d^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left(\|[X, X](\tau)\|_{\max}^{\frac{p}{2}}\right) = d^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} |[X_i, X_j](\tau)|^{\frac{p}{2}}\right) \\ &\leq d^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq d} [X_i, X_i](\tau)^{\frac{p}{4}} [X_j, X_j](\tau)^{\frac{p}{4}}\right) \leq d^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq d} [X_i, X_i](\tau)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right) \\ &\leq 6pd^{\frac{p}{2}+1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \leq \tau} |X_i(s)|^p\right) \leq 6pd^{\frac{p}{2}+1} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \leq \tau} \|X(s)\|_{\max}^p\right) \\ &\leq 6pd^{\frac{p}{2}+1} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \leq \tau} \|X(s)\|^p\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the Kunita–Watanabe (or the Cauchy–Schwarz) inequality in the third step, see for example Protter [93, Theorem II.25]. For the second inequality, we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \leq \tau} \|X(s)\|^p\right) &\leq d^{\frac{p}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \leq \tau} \|X(s)\|_{\max}^p\right) \leq d^{\frac{p}{2}+1} \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \leq \tau} |X_i(s)|^p\right) \\ &\leq 4pd^{\frac{p}{2}+1} \mathbb{E}\left(\|[X, X](\tau)\|_{\max}^{\frac{p}{2}}\right) \leq 4pd^{\frac{p}{2}+1} \mathbb{E}\left(\|[X, X](\tau)\|_{\max}^{\frac{p}{2}}\right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

<sup>6</sup>Here we define  $\|[X, X](\infty)\| := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|[X, X](t)\|$ , which is well-defined because  $[X, X]$  is almost surely increasing in the Loewner order because  $v^\top [X, X] v = [v^\top X, v^\top X]$  is almost surely increasing for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

On the space of  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ -valued càdlàg (or càglàd) adapted processes, we define the (possibly infinite)  $S^p$  norm by  $\|X\|_{S^p} := \left\| \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \|X(t)\|_{L^p} \right\|$  for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ . For an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued semimartingale  $X$ , we can then define the (possibly infinite)  $H^p$  norm by  $\|X\|_{H^p} := \inf_{M,A} \left\{ \|X(0)\| + \|[M, M](\infty)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|A\|(\infty) \right\}$ , where the infimum is taken over all decompositions  $X = X(0) + M + A$  with  $M$  being a local martingale and  $A$  an adapted, càdlàg process of finite variation with  $M(0) = A(0) = 0$  almost surely. Here  $\|A\|$  denotes the total variation process of  $A$ . The Hardy spaces  $S^p$  and  $H^p$  of processes with finite  $S^p$  and  $H^p$  norm can be shown to be Banach spaces, see Dellacherie and Meyer [36, VII.64 and VII.98(e)] in the case  $d = 1$  and  $p < \infty$ . The  $S^p$  and  $H^p$  norms satisfy the following weak inequality:

**Theorem A.23.** *Let  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $c_p$  depending only on  $p$  and  $d$  such that  $\|X\|_{S^p} \leq c_p \|X\|_{H^p}$  for all  $d$ -dimensional semimartingales  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Applying the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality A.22, the fact that the total variation process is increasing, and  $|a + b + c|^p \leq 3^{p-1}(|a|^p + |b|^p + |c|^p)$ , we obtain

$$\|X\|_{S^p}^p \leq 3^{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left( \|X(0)\|^p + \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \|M(t)\|^p + \|A\|(\infty)^p \right) \leq C_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \|X(0)\| + \|[M, M](\infty)\|_{L^p}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|A\|(\infty) \right)^p \right]$$

for some  $C_p$  depending only on  $p$  and  $d$ . Taking  $p$ -th roots and infima finishes the proof.  $\square$

The following theorem provides the multivariate version of Émery’s inequality, attributed to Émery [45], which gives a handy upper bound for  $H^p$  norms of arbitrary stochastic integrals.

**Theorem A.24.** *Let  $H$  be a càglàd, adapted  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ -valued process and  $X$  an  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -valued semimartingale. Moreover, let  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{r}$  for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$  and  $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ . Then*

$$\left\| \int H \, dX \right\|_{H^r} \leq n \sqrt{m} \|H\|_{S^p} \|X - X(0)\|_{H^q}.$$

*Proof.* Fix a semimartingale decomposition  $X = X(0) + M + A$ . Then  $\int H \, dX = \int H \, dM + \int H \, dA$  is a decomposition for  $\int H \, dM$ . Recall that  $[\int H \, dM, \int H \, dM] = \int H \, d[M, M]H^\top$ . We will now show  $\|\int H \, dX\|(t) \leq n \sqrt{m} \sup_{s \leq t} \|H(s)\| \|A\|(t)$ . Since each component  $A_j$  of  $A$  is a univariate process of finite variation, there are unique increasing  $A_j^+$  and  $A_j^-$  such that  $A_j = A_j^+ - A_j^-$  and  $\|\int_a^b H(s) \, dA(s)\| \leq \|\int_a^b H(s) \, dA^+(s)\| + \|\int_a^b H(s) \, dA^-(s)\|$  for all  $a \leq b$ , where  $A^+$  and  $A^-$  denote the  $d$ -dimensional processes with components  $A_j^+$  and  $A_j^-$ . Then, as  $\|x\| \leq \sqrt{m} \|x\|_{\max}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_a^b H(s) \, dA(s) \right\| &\leq \sqrt{m} \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left( \left| \int_a^b H_{ij}(s) \, dA_j^+(s) \right| + \left| \int_a^b H_{ij}(s) \, dA_j^-(s) \right| \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{m} \sup_{a \leq t \leq b} \|H(t)\|_{\max} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left( |A_j|(b) - |A_j|(a) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\|\int H \, dA\|(t) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_t} \sum_{t_i \in \pi} \|\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} H(s) \, dA(s)\| \leq \sqrt{m} \sup_{s \leq t} \|H(s)\|_{\max} \sum_{j=1}^n |A_j|(t)$ , which is itself bounded by  $n \sqrt{m} \sup_{s \leq t} \|H(s)\| \|A\|(t)$ . We have the further bound

$$\left\| \int_0^t H(s) \, d[M, M](s) H(s)^\top \right\| \leq m \left\| \int_0^t H(s) \, d[M, M](s) H(s)^\top \right\|_{\max}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq m \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \sum_{1 \leq l, k \leq n} \left| \int_0^t H_{il}(s) H_{jk}(s) d[M_l, M_k](s) \right| \\
&\leq m \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \sum_{1 \leq l, k \leq n} \left( \int_0^t H_{il}(s)^2 d[M_l, M_l](s) \int_0^t H_{jk}(s)^2 d[M_k, M_k](s) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq mn^2 \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \left( \sup_{s \leq t} |H_{ij}(s)| \right)^2 \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} [M_k, M_k](t) \\
&= mn^2 \left( \sup_{s \leq t} \|H(s)\|_{\max} \right)^2 \|[M, M](t)\|_{\max} \\
&\leq mn^2 \left( \sup_{s \leq t} \|H(s)\| \right)^2 \|[M, M](t)\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Kunita–Watanabe inequality in the third step, see for example Protter [93, Theorem II.25]. This yields

$$\left\| \int H dX \right\|_{H^r} \leq n\sqrt{m} \left\| \left( \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \|H(t)\| \right) \|[M, M](\infty)\|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \|H(t)\| \right) \|A(\infty)\|_{L^r} \right\|$$

An application of Hölder’s inequality yields the result.  $\square$

## References

- [1] D. Ackerer and D. Filipović (2020). Linear Credit Risk Models. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 24.1, pp. 169–214.
- [2] D. Ackerer, D. Filipović, and S. Pulido (2018). The Jacobi stochastic volatility model. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 22.3, pp. 667–700.
- [3] Y. Aït-Sahalia (2002). Maximum Likelihood estimation of discretely sampled diffusions: A closed-form approximation approach. In: *Econometrica* 70.1, pp. 223–262.
- [4] A. Alfonsi (2010). Cox–Ingersoll–Ross (CIR) model. In: R. Cont (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Quantitative Finance, Volume I*, pp. 401–403, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester.
- [5] A. Alj, R. Azrak, C. Ley, and G. Mélaré (2017). Asymptotic properties of QML estimators for VARMA models with time-dependent coefficients. In: *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 44.3, pp. 617–635.
- [6] E. Alòs and D. G. Lorite (2021). *Malliavin Calculus in Finance: Theory and Practice*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- [7] B. D. O. Anderson and J. B. Moore (1979). *Optimal Filtering*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [8] D. W. K. Andrews (1991). Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix estimation. In: *Econometrica* 59.3, pp. 817–858.
- [9] — (1992). Generic Uniform Convergence. In: *Econometric Theory* 8.2, pp. 241–257.
- [10] R. Azencott (1981). Géodésiques et diffusions en temps petit. Volume 84 of *Astérisque*. Société Mathématique de France, Paris. Probability Seminar, University of Paris VII, Paris.
- [11] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen and N. Shephard (2001). Non-Gaussian Ornstein–Uhlenbeck-based models and some of their uses in financial economics. In: *The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 63.2, pp. 167–241.

- [12] I. V. Basawa and B. L. S. Prakasa Rao (1980). *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes*. Academic Press, London.
- [13] D. S. Bates (2006). Maximum Likelihood estimation of latent affine processes. In: *The Review of Financial Studies* 19.3, pp. 909–965.
- [14] A. Behme (2011). Distributional properties of solutions of  $dV_T = V_T dU_T + dL_T$  with Lévy noise. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* 43.3, pp. 688–711.
- [15] A. Behme and A. Lindner (2012). Multivariate generalized Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 122.4, pp. 1487–1518.
- [16] F. E. Benth, J. Kallsen, and T. Meyer-Brandis (2006). A non-Gaussian Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process for electricity spot price modelling and derivatives pricing. In: *Applied Mathematical Finance* 14.2, pp. 153–169.
- [17] F. E. Benth and S. Lavagnini (2021). Correlators of polynomial processes. In: *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics* 12.4, pp. 1374–1415.
- [18] D. S. Bernstein (2011). *Matrix Mathematics: Theory, Facts, and Formulas*. 2nd Edition. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- [19] F. Biagini and Y. Zhang (2016). Polynomial diffusion models for life insurance liabilities. In: *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 71.C, pp. 114–129.
- [20] P. J. Bickel, Y. Ritov, and T. Rydén (1998). Asymptotic normality of the Maximum-Likelihood estimator for general hidden Markov models. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 26.4, pp. 1614–1635.
- [21] P. Billingsley (1986). *Probability and Measure*. 2nd Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NYA.
- [22] T. Bollerslev (1986). Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 31.3, pp. 307–327.
- [23] T. Bollerslev and H. Zhou (2002). Estimating stochastic volatility diffusions using conditional moments of integrated volatility. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 109.1, pp. 33–65.
- [24] Y. Boubacar Maïnassara (2014). Estimation of the variance of the Quasi-Maximum Likelihood estimator of weak VARMA models. In: *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 8.2, pp. 2701–2740.
- [25] Y. Boubacar Maïnassara, M. Carbon, and C. Francq (2012). Computing and estimating information matrices of weak ARMA models. In: *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 56.2, pp. 345–361.
- [26] Y. Boubacar Maïnassara and C. Francq (2011). Estimating structural VARMA models with uncorrelated but non-independent error terms. In: *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 102.3, pp. 496–505.
- [27] E. Çinlar and M. A. Pinsky (1971). A stochastic integral in storage theory. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 17, pp. 227–240.
- [28] J. C. Cox, J. E. Ingersoll, and S. A. Ross (1985). A theory of the term structure of interest rates. In: *Econometrica* 53.2, pp. 385–407.
- [29] C. Cuchiero (2011). Affine and polynomial processes. Doctoral thesis, ETH Zürich.
- [30] — (2019). Polynomial processes in stochastic portfolio theory. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 129.5, pp. 1829–1872.
- [31] C. Cuchiero, M. Keller-Ressel, and J. Teichmann (2012). Polynomial processes and their applications to mathematical finance. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 16.4, pp. 711–740.
- [32] R. B. D’Agostino and E. S. Pearson (1973). Tests for departure from normality. In: *Biometrika* 60.3, pp. 613–622.

- [33] R. B. Davies (1980). Algorithm AS 155: The distribution of a linear combination of  $\chi^2$  random variables. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)* 29.3, pp. 323–333.
- [34] S. Del Baño Rollin, A. Ferreira-Castilla, and F. Utzet (2010). On the density of the log-spot in the Heston volatility model. In: *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* 120.10, pp. 2037–2063.
- [35] F. Delbaen and H. Shirakawa (2002). An interest rate model with upper and lower bounds. In: *Asia-Pacific Financial Markets* 9.3-4, pp. 191–209.
- [36] C. Dellacherie and P.-A. Meyer (1982). *Probabilities and Potential B: Theory of Martingales*. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [37] J. L. Doob (1944). The elementary Gaussian processes. In: *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 15.3, pp. 229–282.
- [38] R. Douc, E. Moulines, J. Olsson, and R. Van Handel (2011). Consistency of the Maximum Likelihood estimator for general hidden Markov models. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 39.1, pp. 474–513.
- [39] G. R. Duffee (2002). Term premia and interest rate forecasts in affine models. In: *The Journal of Finance* 57.1, pp. 405–443.
- [40] D. Duffie, D. Filipović, and W. Schachermayer (2003). Affine processes and applications in finance. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 13.3, pp. 984–1053.
- [41] D. Duffie, J. Pan, and K. Singleton (2000). Transform analysis and asset pricing for affine jump-diffusions. In: *Econometrica* 68.6, pp. 1343–1376.
- [42] W. T. M. Dunsmuir and E. J. Hannan (1976). Vector linear time series models. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* 8.2, pp. 339–364.
- [43] A. Dvoretzky (1972). Asymptotic normality for sums of dependent random variables. In: *Proceedings of the Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, pp. 513–535.
- [44] E. Eberlein and J. Kallsen (2019). *Mathematical Finance*. Springer, Cham.
- [45] M. Émery (1978). Stabilité des solutions des équations différentielles stochastiques applications aux intégrales multiplicatives stochastiques. In: *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 41, pp. 241–226.
- [46] R. F. Engle (1984). Wald, Likelihood Ratio and Lagrange Multiplier tests in econometrics. In: Z. Griliches and M. Intriligator (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics, Volume II*, pp. 776–826, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [47] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz (1986). *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester.
- [48] R. W. Farebrother (1984). Algorithm AS 204: The distribution of a positive linear combination of chi-squared random variables. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)* 3.3, pp. 332–339.
- [49] V. Fasen (2013). Statistical estimation of multivariate Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes and applications to co-integration. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 172.2, pp. 325–337.
- [50] L. V. Fausett (2009). Sylvester matrix differential equations: Analytical and numerical solutions. In: *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics* 53.1, pp. 55–68.
- [51] D. Filipović, E. Gourier, and L. Mancini (2016). Quadratic variance swap models. In: *Journal of Financial Economics* 119.1, pp. 44–68.
- [52] D. Filipović and M. Larsson (2016). Polynomial diffusions and applications in finance. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 20.4, pp. 931–972.

- [53] D. Filipović and M. Larsson (2020). Polynomial jump-diffusion models. In: *Stochastic Systems* 10.1, pp. 71–97.
- [54] D. Filipović, E. Mayerhofer, and P. Schneider (2013). Density approximations for multivariate affine jump-diffusion processes. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 176.2, pp. 93–111.
- [55] D. Filipović and S. Willems (2020). A term structure model for dividends and interest rates. In: *Mathematical Finance* 30.4, pp. 1461–1496.
- [56] M. Fisher and C. Gilles (1996). Estimating exponential-affine models of the term structure. Working Paper. Federal Reserve Board.
- [57] P. M. Fitzpatrick (2006). *Advanced Calculus*. 2nd Edition. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
- [58] C. Francq, R. Roy, and J.-M. Zakoïan (2005). Diagnostic checking in ARMA models with uncorrelated errors. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 100.470, pp. 532–544.
- [59] R. R. Goldberg (1976). *Methods of Real Analysis*. 2nd Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY.
- [60] M. I. Gordin and B. A. Lifšic (1978). Central limit theorem for stationary Markov processes. In: *Dokladi Akademii Nauk SSSR* 239.4, pp. 766–767.
- [61] J. J. Green (1996). Uniform Convergence to the Spectral Radius and Some Related Properties in Banach Algebras. Doctoral thesis, University of Sheffield.
- [62] P. Hall and C. C. Heyde (1980). *Martingale Limit Theory and Its Application*. Academic Press, New York, NY.
- [63] S. L. Heston (1993). A closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility with applications to bond and currency options. In: *The Review of Financial Studies* 6.2, pp. 327–343.
- [64] C. C. Heyde (1997). *Quasi-likelihood and its application: A general approach to optimal parameter estimation*. Springer New York, New York, NY.
- [65] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson (2012). *Matrix Analysis*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [66] A. S. Hurn, K. A. Lindsay, and A. J. McClelland (2013). A Quasi-Maximum Likelihood method for estimating the parameters of multivariate diffusions. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 172.1, pp. 106–126.
- [67] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe (1989). *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes*. 2nd Edition. Kodansha Ltd., Tokyo.
- [68] J. P. Imhof (1961). Computing the distribution of quadratic forms in normal variables. In: *Biometrika* 48.3-4, pp. 419–426.
- [69] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev (2003). *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. 2nd Edition. Springer, Berlin.
- [70] J. Jacod and M. Sørensen (2018). A review of asymptotic theory of estimating functions. In: *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* 21.2, pp. 415–434.
- [71] R. I. Jennrich (1969). Asymptotic properties of non-linear least squares estimators. In: *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 40.2, pp. 633–643.
- [72] G. J. Jiang and J. L. Knight (2006). Estimation of continuous-time processes via empirical characteristic function. In: *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 20.2, pp. 198–212.
- [73] J. Kallsen and I. Richert (2025). *Filtering of partially observed polynomial processes in discrete and continuous time*. Preprint.

- [74] K. Kawazu and S. Watanabe (1971). Branching processes with immigration and related limit theorems. In: *Theory of Probability and its Applications* 16.1, pp. 36–54.
- [75] X. Kleisinger-Yu, V. Komaric, M. Larsson, and M. Regez (2020). A multifactor polynomial framework for long-term electricity forwards with delivery period. In: *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics* 11.3, pp. 928–957.
- [76] C. Klüppelberg, A. Lindner, and R. Maller (2004). A continuous-time GARCH process driven by a Lévy process: Stationarity and second-order behaviour. In: *Journal of Applied Probability* 41.3, pp. 601–622.
- [77] P. Lancaster and H. K. Farahat (1972). Norms on direct sums and tensor products. In: *Mathematics of Computation* 26.118, pp. 401–414.
- [78] E. Liescher (2005). Towards a unified approach for proving geometric ergodicity and mixing properties of nonlinear autoregressive processes. In: *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 26.5, pp. 669–689.
- [79] A. Lindner and R. Maller (2005). Lévy integrals and the stationarity of generalised Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 115.10, pp. 1701–1722.
- [80] H. Liu, Y. Tang, and H. H. Zhang (2009). A new chi-square approximation to the distribution of non-negative definite quadratic forms in non-central normal variables. In: *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 53.4, pp. 853–856.
- [81] R. Lord, R. Koekkoek, and D. J. C. van Dijk (2010). A comparison of biased simulation schemes for stochastic volatility models. In: *Quantitative Finance* 10.2, pp. 177–194.
- [82] K. W. Lu (2022). Calibration for multivariate Lévy-driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck with applications to weak subordination. In: *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* 25.2, pp. 365–396.
- [83] H. Masuda (2004). On multidimensional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes driven by a general Lévy process. In: *Bernoulli* 10.1, pp. 91–120.
- [84] G. Mélard (2022). An indirect proof of the asymptotic properties of VARMA model estimators. In: *Econometrics and Statistics* 21.C, pp. 96–111.
- [85] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie (2009). *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [86] H. Neudecker (1969). A note on Kronecker matrix products and matrix equation systems. In: *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 17.3, pp. 603–606.
- [87] W. K. Newey and K. D. West (1987). A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. In: *Econometrica* 55.3, pp. 703–708.
- [88] I. Nourdin and F. G. Viens (2009). Density formula and concentration inequalities with Malliavin calculus. In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 14, pp. 2287–2309.
- [89] J. J. O’Donnel (1966). Asymptotic solution of the matrix Riccati equation of optimal control. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Allerton Conference on Circuit and System Theory*, pp. 577–587.
- [90] K. B. Petersen and M. S. Pedersen (2012). *The Matrix Cookbook*. Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby.
- [91] E. Priola and J. Zabczyk (2007). Densities for Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes with jumps. In: *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* 41.1, pp. 41–50.
- [92] Y. V. Prokhorov (1956). Convergence of random processes and limit theorems in probability theory. In: *Theory of Probability and Its Applications* 1.2, pp. 157–214.

- [93] P. E. Protter (2004). *Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations*. 2nd Edition. Springer, Berlin.
- [94] D. Revuz and M. Yor (1999). *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion*. 3rd Edition. Springer, Berlin.
- [95] K. Sato (1999). *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [96] K. Sato and M. Yamazato (1983). Stationary processes of Ornstein–Uhlenbeck type. In: K. Itô and Y. V. Prokhorov (Eds.), *Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 541–551, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany.
- [97] — (1984). Operator-selfdecomposable distributions as limit distributions of processes of Ornstein–Uhlenbeck type. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 17.1, pp. 73–100.
- [98] — (1985). Completely operator-selfdecomposable distributions and operator-stable distributions. In: *Nagoya Mathematical Journal* 97, pp. 71–94.
- [99] E. Schlemm and R. Stelzer (2012a). Multivariate CARMA processes, continuous-time state space models and complete regularity of the innovations of the sampled processes. In: *Bernoulli* 18.1, pp. 46–63.
- [100] — (2012b). Quasi Maximum Likelihood estimation for strongly mixing state space models and multivariate Lévy-driven CARMA processes. In: *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 6, pp. 2185–2234.
- [101] D. W. Scott (1992). *Multivariate Density Estimation: Theory, Practice, and Visualization*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Chichester.
- [102] T. Simon (2011). On the absolute continuity of multidimensional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 151.1, pp. 173–190.
- [103] K. Singleton (2001). Estimation of affine asset pricing models using the empirical characteristic function. In: *Journal of Econometrics* 252.1-3, pp. 61–70.
- [104] M. Sørensen (2012). Estimating functions for diffusion-type processes. In: M. Kessler, A. Lindner, M. Sørensen (Eds.), *Statistical methods for stochastic differential equations*, pp. 1–107, Chapman, and Hall/CRC, New York, NY.
- [105] K. V. Spiliopoulos (2009). Method of moments estimation of Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes driven by general Lévy processes. In: *Annales de l’ISUP* 53.2-3, pp. 3–18.
- [106] E. Taufer and N. N. Leonenko (2009). Characteristic function estimation of non-Gaussian Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes. In: *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 139.9, pp. 3050–3063.
- [107] D. S. Tracy and R. P. Singh (1972). A new matrix product and its applications in partitioned matrix differentiation. In: *Statistica Neerlandica* 26.4, pp. 143–157.
- [108] G. E. Uhlenbeck and L. S. Ornstein (1930). On the theory of Brownian motion. In: *Physical Reviews* 36.5, pp. 823–841.
- [109] L. Valdivieso, W. Schoutens, and F. Tuerlinckx (2009). Maximum Likelihood estimation in processes of Ornstein–Uhlenbeck type. In: *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* 12.1, pp. 1–19.
- [110] A. W. van der Vaart (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [111] O. Vašíček (1977). An equilibrium characterization of the term structure. In: *Journal of Financial Economics* 5.2, pp. 177–188.

- [112] X. Wang, X. He, Y. Bao, and Y. Zhao (2018). Parameter estimates of Heston stochastic volatility model with MLE and consistent EKF algorithm. In: *Science China Information Sciences* 61, 042202:1–042202:17.
- [113] T. Ware (2019). Polynomial processes for power prices. In: *Applied Mathematical Finance* 26.5, pp. 453–474.
- [114] D. Williams (1991). *Probability With Martingales*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [115] H. Zhou (2003). Itô conditional moment generator and the estimation of short-rate processes. In: *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 1.2, pp. 250–271.