

LOCAL LINEAR QUANTILE ESTIMATION FOR NONSTATIONARY TIME SERIES

BY ZHOU ZHOU AND WEI BIAO WU

University of Chicago

We consider estimation of quantile curves for a general class of nonstationary processes. Consistency and central limit results are obtained for local linear quantile estimates under a mild short-range dependence condition. Our results are applied to environmental data sets. In particular, our results can be used to address the problem of whether climate variability has changed, an important problem raised by IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) in 2001.

1. Introduction. Nonstationary time series analysis has attracted considerable attention recently; see, for example, [Priestley \(1988\)](#), [Dahlhaus \(1997\)](#), [Mallat, Papanicolaou and Zhang \(1998\)](#), [Nason, von Sachs and Kroisandt \(2000\)](#), [Giurcanu and Spokoiny \(2004\)](#) and [Ombao, von Sachs and Guo \(2005\)](#), among others. Many of the previous results concern estimation of second-order characteristics such as covariance functions and time-varying spectra.

The primary goal of the paper is to estimate quantile curves of a special class of nonstationary processes that can be loosely called locally stationary processes. Conceptually, local stationarity means that the physical mechanism generating such processes changes smoothly in time [Mallat, Papanicolaou and Zhang (1998)]. For the purpose of estimating quantile curves of locally stationary processes, the classical framework which is based on second-order characteristics does not seem to be quite suitable. In particular, to estimate quantile functions of heavy-tailed processes, one cannot directly apply results which are based on covariance functions.

Here we shall adopt the following formulation. Let the observed sequence $\{X_{i,n}\}_{i=1}^n$ be generated from the model

$$(1) \quad X_{i,n} = G(i/n, \Upsilon_i),$$

Received March 2008; revised July 2008.

AMS 2000 subject classifications. Primary 62G05; secondary 60F05.

Key words and phrases. Bahadur representation, climate change, global warming, local linear regression, local stationarity, nonstationary nonlinear time series, quantile estimation, smoothing.

| |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>This is an electronic reprint of the original article published by the Institute of Mathematical Statistics in <i>The Annals of Statistics</i>, 2009, Vol. 37, No. 5B, 2696–2729. This reprint differs from the original in pagination and typographic detail.</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

where $\Upsilon_i = (\dots, \varepsilon_{i-1}, \varepsilon_i)$ and $\varepsilon_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables, and $G: [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^\infty \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function such that $\zeta_i(t) := G(t, \Upsilon_i)$ is a properly defined random variable for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Let $F(t, x) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta_i(t) \leq x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ be the cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) of $\zeta_i(t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$; let $Q_\alpha(t)$ be the α th quantile function of $\zeta_i(t)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, namely $Q_\alpha(t) = \inf_x \{F(t, x) \geq \alpha\}$. We shall estimate $Q_\alpha(t)$, the α th quantile curve, from $\{X_{i,n}\}_{i=1}^n$ by the local linear approach. In the sequel for notational convenience we shall write $X_{i,n}$ as X_i .

Process (1) is nonstationary. It covers a wide range of nonstationary processes and it naturally extends many existing stationary time series models into the nonstationary setting; see examples in Section 4. [Wiener \(1958\)](#) claimed that, for any stationary ergodic process (X_i) , there exists a measurable function G and i.i.d. random variables $\varepsilon_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that $X_i = G(\Upsilon_i)$ holds for all i ; see also [Tong \(1990\)](#), page 204. The latter relation can be interpreted as a physical system with Υ_i and X_i being the input and the output, respectively, and G being the transform or filter that represents the underlying physical mechanism. See [Wu \(2005\)](#) for further references. In (1), by allowing the data generating mechanism G depending on the time index t in such a way that $G(t, \Upsilon_i)$ changes smoothly with respect to t , one has local stationarity in the sense that the subsequence $\{X_i, \dots, X_{i+j-1}\}$ is approximately stationary if its length j is sufficiently small compared to n .

Estimation of quantile curves is an important problem. The report *Climate Change 2001* written by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) addresses the serious problem of whether the climate variability or climate extremes have changed. Prominent changes in climate variability can have a devastating impact upon the environment. In this paper, we shall interpret climate extremes as upper and lower quantiles such as $Q_{0.95}(t)$ or $Q_{0.05}(t)$. By estimating such quantile curves, we obtain more detailed distributional information about the underlying process than the mean and the variability based on covariances; see [Yu, Lu and Stander \(2003\)](#) and [Koenker \(2005\)](#) for more discussions.

There is a large literature on state domain nonparametric conditional quantile estimation where an i.i.d. or stationary series $(Y_i, X_i)_{i=1}^n$ is observed and one is interested in estimating the conditional quantiles of Y_i given X_i ; see, for instance, [Bhattacharya and Gangopadhyay \(1990\)](#), [Chaudhuri \(1991\)](#), Chapter 6 of [Fan and Gijbels \(1996\)](#) and [Yu and Jones \(1998\)](#) for i.i.d. data and [Abberger \(1997\)](#), [Abberger and Heiler \(2002\)](#), [Cai \(2002\)](#) and [Cai and Xu \(2005\)](#) for stationary strong mixing time series. For other contributions see [Cheng and Parzen \(1997\)](#) and [Csörgő and Mielniczuk \(1996\)](#). On the other hand, there are much fewer results on time domain nonparametric quantile estimation, and people are mostly interested in the subordinated Gaussian process $X_i = H(i/n, Z_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, where (Z_i) is a stationary

Gaussian process and H is a measurable function; see [Ghosh, Beran and Innes \(1997\)](#) and [Ghosh and Draghicescu \(2002a, 2002b\)](#), among others.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the local linear quantile estimates, dependence measures and regularity conditions. Central limit theorems and Bahadur representations are stated in Section 3 and proved in Section 6. Section 4 presents examples of nonstationary linear processes and nonstationary nonlinear time series models. Applications to environmental data are given in Section 5.

2. Preliminaries. We now introduce some notation. For a vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, let $|\mathbf{v}| = (\sum_{i=1}^p v_i^2)^{1/2}$. For a $p \times p$ matrix A , define $|A| = \sup\{|A\mathbf{v}| : |\mathbf{v}| = 1\}$. For a random vector \mathbf{V} , write $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{L}^q$ ($q > 0$) if $\|\mathbf{V}\|_q := [\mathbb{E}(|\mathbf{V}|^q)]^{1/q} < \infty$ and $\|\mathbf{V}\| = \|\mathbf{V}\|_2$. Denote by \Rightarrow the weak convergence. For an interval $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}$, denote by $\mathcal{C}^i \mathcal{I}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the collection of functions that have i th order continuous derivatives on \mathcal{I} , and, for $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let \mathcal{CD} be the collection of real-valued functions that are continuous on \mathcal{D} . A function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said Lipschitz continuous on $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ if there exists a finite constant C , such that $|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \leq C|x_1 - x_2|$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{D}$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, define $x^+ = \max(x, 0)$. The symbol C denotes a finite generic constant which may vary from line to line.

2.1. Local linear quantile estimator. Observe that $Q_\alpha(t)$, the α th quantile function of $\zeta_i(t)$, satisfies

$$(2) \quad Q_\alpha(t) = \arg \min_{\beta_0} \mathbb{E}\{\rho_\alpha(\zeta_i(t) - \beta_0) - \rho_\alpha(\zeta_i(t))\},$$

where $\rho_\alpha(x) = \alpha x^+ + (1 - \alpha)(-x)^+$ is the check function [[Koenker \(2005\)](#)]. As $Q_\alpha(t_1) \approx Q_\alpha(t) + (t_1 - t)Q'_\alpha(t)$ for t_1 close to t , it is natural to estimate $Q_\alpha(t)$ and $Q'_\alpha(t)$ via

$$(3) \quad (\hat{Q}_{\alpha, b_n}(t), \hat{Q}'_{\alpha, b_n}(t)) = \arg \min_{(\beta_0, \beta_1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\alpha(X_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1(i/n - t))K_{b_n}(i/n - t),$$

where K is a kernel function, $K_{b_n}(\cdot) = K(\cdot/b_n)$ and $b_n > 0$ is the bandwidth. We shall omit the subscript b_n in \hat{Q} and \hat{Q}' hereafter if no confusion will be caused.

Note that (3) defines a local linear quantile estimate, while the analogous version of (2) gives a local constant estimate; see (10). [Draghicescu, Guillas and Wu \(2008\)](#) considered local constant quantile estimation. In the context of local polynomial regression based on mean squared errors (MSE), [Fan and Gijbels \(1996\)](#) argued that the local linear estimate is generally better than the local constant estimate since the latter suffers from the notorious boundary problem. Proposition 1 below asserts that, for quantile curve estimation, the local linear approach can also alleviate the boundary problem.

2.2. *Dependence measures and regularity conditions.* To study \hat{Q} in (3), it is necessary to introduce appropriate dependence measures. Following Wu (2005), we shall adopt *physical dependence measures* for a family of stochastic processes. All our results will be expressed in terms of these dependence measures.

DEFINITION 1. Let $\{H(t, x, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $(t, x) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, be a family of stochastic processes with $H(t, x, \Upsilon_i) \in \mathcal{L}^2$. Let $\varepsilon'_0, \varepsilon_j$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, be i.i.d. For $k \geq 0$, let $\Upsilon_k^* = (\Upsilon_{-1}, \varepsilon'_0, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k)$ and define the physical dependence measure

$$(4) \quad \delta_H(k) = \sup_{(t, x) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}} \|H(t, x, \Upsilon_k) - H(t, x, \Upsilon_k^*)\|.$$

Here we recall $\|\cdot\| = [\mathbb{E}(|\cdot|^2)]^{1/2}$. We say that the system $\{H(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable if

$$(5) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \delta_H(k) < \infty.$$

Observe that $\delta_H(k)$ measures the dependence of $H(t, x, \Upsilon_k)$ on the input ε_0 over $(t, x) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. Condition (5) indicates that the cumulative impact of ε_0 on future values is bounded, thus suggesting short-range dependence. At a fixed $(t, x) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, if $H(t, x, \Upsilon_i)$ is a linear process, (5) reduces to the stability condition introduced in Box, Jenkins and Reinsel (1994). All the results of this paper will be derived under this short-range dependence condition. If the stability condition (5) is violated, namely if the sum in equation (5) is infinite, then we have a long-memory process and the asymptotic theory developed in the paper does not work. Note that $\delta_H(k)$ is closely related to the data generating mechanism and hence is easy to work with; see examples in Section 4 and also Wu (2005).

Hereafter we shall assume that $K(\cdot) \in \mathcal{K}$, where \mathcal{K} is the collection of density functions K such that K is symmetric with support $[-1, 1]$ and $K \in \mathcal{C}^1[-1, 1]$. A popular choice is the Epanechnikov kernel $K(u) = 3 \max(0, 1 - u^2)/4$. For $K \in \mathcal{K}$ let $\phi_K = \int_{-1}^1 K^2(u) du$. Define $\mu_{j, K} = 2 \int_0^1 u^j K(u) du$ if $j \in \mathbb{N}$ is even, and $\mu_{j, K} = \int_0^1 u^j K(u) du$ if $j \in \mathbb{N}$ is odd. We shall abbreviate ϕ_K (resp. $\mu_{j, K}$) as ϕ (resp. μ_j) if no confusion will be caused.

Note that, for fixed t , $\{\zeta_i(t)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary process. We shall impose the following regularity conditions:

- (A1) For every $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $Q_\alpha(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^2[0, 1]$.
- (A2) $f(t, x) \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R})$, where $f(t, \cdot)$ is the density function of $\zeta_i(t)$.
- (A3) (Stochastic Lipschitz Continuity) There exists $C, q > 0$, such that $\|\zeta_i(t_1) - \zeta_i(t_2)\|_q \leq C|t_1 - t_2|$ holds for all $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$.

Condition (A3) indicates that the underlying data generating mechanism $G(t, \cdot)$ changes smoothly in time, thus suggesting local stationarity. Conditions (A1)–(A3) are needed in the sense that, without them, it might be impossible to estimate quantile curves of the series from its stochastic variation [see the discussions in Chapter 6 in [Fan and Yao \(2003\)](#)]. We will not consider the possibility of jumps in quantile curves in this paper.

3. Main results.

3.1. *Asymptotic normality.* Let $\psi_\alpha(x) = \alpha - I\{x \leq 0\}$ be the left derivative of $\rho_\alpha(x)$. Theorem 1 asserts that, for $t \in (0, 1)$, $nb_n f(t, Q_\alpha(t))[\hat{Q}_\alpha(t) - Q_\alpha(t)]$ can be approximated by the linear form

$$T_{\alpha,n}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_\alpha(X_i - Q_\alpha(t) - Q'_\alpha(t)(i/n - t))K_{b_n}(i/n - t)$$

with an $o_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{1/2})$ error. Due to the linearity it is easier to deal with $T_{\alpha,n}(t) - \mathbb{E}[T_{\alpha,n}(t)]$ which is asymptotically normal under proper conditions. Recall $\phi = \int_{-1}^1 K^2(u) du$ and $\zeta_i(t) = G(t, \Upsilon_i)$.

THEOREM 1. *Assume $b_n \rightarrow 0$ and $nb_n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $t \in (0, 1)$, $J(t, x, \Upsilon_i) = I\{G(t, \Upsilon_i) \leq x\}$ and $F(t, x, \Upsilon_i) = \mathbb{P}(G(t, \Upsilon_{i+1}) \leq x | \Upsilon_i)$. Further assume $f(t, Q_\alpha(t)) > 0$, (A1) and (A2), and that the family $\{F(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable. Then*

$$(6) \quad (nb_n + O(1))f(t, Q_\alpha(t))[\hat{Q}_\alpha(t) - Q_\alpha(t)] - T_{\alpha,n}(t) = o_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{1/2}).$$

Additionally, assume (A3), $nb_n^5 = O(1)$ and

$$(7) \quad \sigma^2(t) := \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_0 J(t, Q_\alpha(t), \Upsilon_i) \right\|^2 > 0,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_0(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}(\cdot | \Upsilon_0) - \mathbb{E}(\cdot | \Upsilon_{-1})$. Then the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) holds:

$$(8) \quad (nb_n)^{1/2}[\hat{Q}_\alpha(t) - Q_\alpha(t) - b_n^2 \mu_2 Q''_\alpha(t)/2] \Rightarrow N(0, \phi \sigma^2(t)/f^2(t, Q_\alpha(t))).$$

Since $\{F(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable, $\sigma^2(t)$ exists and is finite; see (37). We call $\sigma^2(t)$ the long-run variance which is due to the dependence of the series. If $J(t, Q_\alpha(t), \Upsilon_i)$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, are independent, then $\sigma^2(t) = \text{var}(J(t, Q_\alpha(t), \Upsilon_i)) = \alpha(1 - \alpha)$. Theorem 1 entails the following corollary on interquartile range (IQR), a simple measure for the spread of distributions.

COROLLARY 1. Let $IQR(t) = Q_{0.75}(t) - Q_{0.25}(t)$ and $\widehat{IQR}(t) = \widehat{Q}_{0.75}(t) - \widehat{Q}_{0.25}(t)$. Let conditions in Theorem 1 be satisfied with $\alpha = 0.75$ and $\alpha = 0.25$. Let $J_{IQR}(t, \Upsilon_i) = J(t, Q_{0.75}(t), \Upsilon_i)/f(t, Q_{0.75}(t)) - J(t, Q_{0.25}(t), \Upsilon_i)/f(t, Q_{0.25}(t))$ and assume that $\sigma_{IQR}(t) := \|\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_0 J_{IQR}(t, \Upsilon_i)\| > 0$. Then

$$(9) \quad (nb_n)^{1/2}[\widehat{IQR}(t) - IQR(t) - b_n^2 \mu_2 IQR''(t)/2] \Rightarrow N(0, \phi \sigma_{IQR}^2(t)).$$

An important issue in applying Theorem 1 is the choice of the bandwidth b_n . A data-driven procedure is given in Section 3.1.1.

We now study the boundary behavior of the local linear estimates. In the context of quantile estimation for stationary processes, Cai and Xu (2005) argued that the local polynomial estimates have a better performance than the local constant estimates. Proposition 1 concerns left boundary points. Analogous results hold for right boundary points. It shows that the local linear quantile estimator alleviates the boundary problem in that the asymptotic MSEs induced by (8) and (12) are of the same order. For local constant quantile estimate, however, (11) implies that its rate of convergence is slower at the boundary points. Let $Q'_\alpha(0+), Q''_\alpha(0+), \dots$, be right derivatives of Q_α at 0.

PROPOSITION 1 (Boundary behavior). Define the local constant estimate

$$(10) \quad \bar{Q}_{\alpha, b_n}(t) = \arg \min_{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\alpha(X_i - \beta) K_{b_n}(i/n - t).$$

Under assumptions of Theorem 1 with $t = 0$, we have: (i)

$$(11) \quad (nb_n/2)^{1/2} f(0, Q_\alpha(0)) \{ \bar{Q}_\alpha(0) - Q_\alpha(0) - 2b_n [Q'_\alpha(0+) \mu_1 + o(1)] \} \\ \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(0) \phi)$$

and (ii) for the local linear estimate $\hat{Q}_\alpha(0)$,

$$(12) \quad (nb_n)^{1/2} f(0, Q_\alpha(0)) [\hat{Q}_\alpha(0) - Q_\alpha(0) - b_n^2 Q''_\alpha(0+) B_K / 2] \\ \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(0) V_K),$$

where $B_K = (\mu_2^2 - 4\mu_1\mu_3)/(\mu_2 - 4\mu_1^2)$ and $V_K = 4 \int_0^1 (\mu_2 - 2\mu_1 u)^2 K(u)^2 du / (\mu_2 - 4\mu_1^2)^2$.

3.1.1. *Bandwidth selection.* For the estimate $\hat{Q}_\alpha(\cdot) = \hat{Q}_{\alpha, b_n}(\cdot)$, based on (8) of Theorem 1, we define the weighted asymptotic mean integrated squared error (AMISE) as

$$AMISE(\hat{Q}_{\alpha, b_n}) = \int_0^1 \{ [b_n^2 \mu_2 Q''_\alpha(t)/2]^2 + [\phi \sigma^2(t)/(nb_n)] \} f^2(t, Q_\alpha(t)) dt.$$

Here the weight $f^2(t, Q_\alpha(t))$ indicates the abundance of data for estimating $Q_\alpha(t)$. With more data in the neighborhood of $(t, Q_\alpha(t))$, we can have a more accurate estimate and therefore a larger weight is assigned. Observe that the optimal AMISE bandwidth

$$(13) \quad b_n(\alpha) = \left\{ \frac{\phi \int_0^1 \sigma^2(t) dt}{n\mu_2^2 \int_0^1 [Q_\alpha''(t)]^2 f^2(t, Q_\alpha(t)) dt} \right\}^{1/5}$$

is of order $n^{-1/5}$. For independent data, several authors have considered the bandwidth selection problem for quantile smoothing; see, for example, [Fan and Gijbels \(1996\)](#) and [Yu and Jones \(1998\)](#) (YJ hereafter). Denote by $b_n^{\text{ind}}(\alpha)$ the optimal bandwidth obtained under independence. By YJ and (13),

$$(14) \quad \frac{b_n(\alpha)}{b_n^{\text{ind}}(\alpha)} = \left[\frac{\int_0^1 \sigma^2(t) dt}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \right]^{1/5} := \rho^*(\alpha).$$

Note that $\alpha(1-\alpha) = \text{var}(J(t, Q_\alpha(t), \Upsilon_i))$ and $\rho^*(\alpha)$ is called the variance correction factor which accounts for the dependence. YJ proposed a simple and easy-to-use rule of thumb selector for $b_n^{\text{ind}}(\alpha)$, which we denote by $b_{n,YJ}(\alpha)$. Our idea is to use $b_n(\alpha)$ by correcting $b_{n,YJ}(\alpha)$ by a factor of $\hat{\rho}^*(\alpha)$, an estimate of $\rho^*(\alpha)$. More precisely, let

$$\hat{\rho}^*(\alpha) = \frac{(\tilde{\sigma}^2)^{1/5}}{(\alpha(1-\alpha))^{1/5}},$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\tilde{m}}{n - \tilde{m} + 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-\tilde{m}+1} \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{m}} \sum_{i=j}^{j+\tilde{m}-1} \varsigma_{i,\alpha} - \bar{\varsigma}_{n,\alpha} \right)^2,$$

$\varsigma_{i,\alpha} = \psi_\alpha(X_i - \hat{Q}_{\alpha, b_{n,YJ}(\alpha)}(t))$, $\bar{\varsigma}_{n,\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^n \varsigma_{i,\alpha} / n$ and $\tilde{m} = \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor$. Here $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ is a block estimate of long-run variance. See also discussions in [Section 3.4](#). Following similar arguments as those of [Theorem 5](#), it can be shown that $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ converges weakly to $\int_0^1 \sigma^2(t) dt$. We suggest

$$(15) \quad b_n^*(\alpha) = b_{n,YJ}(\alpha) \times \hat{\rho}^*(\alpha).$$

As pointed out by a referee, there are time blocks where the distribution of the time series (or a few particular quantiles of interest) changes more quickly than others. This suggests using a bandwidth that could change with time. In general, variable bandwidth selection can be done by performing (15) locally. More precisely, similar to (14), the optimal asymptotic MSE local bandwidth $b_n(\alpha, t)$ satisfies

$$\frac{b_n(\alpha, t)}{b_n^{\text{ind}}(\alpha, t)} = \left[\frac{\sigma^2(t)}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \right]^{1/5} := \rho^*(\alpha, t),$$

where $b_n^{\text{ind}}(\alpha, t)$ is the optimal MSE local bandwidth under independence and $\rho^*(\alpha, t)$ is called the local variance correction factor. Here $\sigma^2(t)$ can be estimated using (25) in Section 3.4.

3.2. Bahadur representations. Bahadur representation is an important tool for asymptotic analysis of estimators and it provides deep insight into properties of estimators by approximating them by linear forms. See, for instance, He and Shao (1996), Koenker (2005) and Wu (2007a), and references therein. In this section we shall obtain both locally and globally uniform Bahadur representations for the estimated quantile curve $\hat{Q}_\alpha(\cdot)$. Define $\hat{\theta}_{\alpha,n}(t) = (\hat{\theta}_{\alpha,n,1}(t), \hat{\theta}_{\alpha,n,2}(t))^\top := (\hat{Q}_\alpha(t) - Q_\alpha(t), b_n(\hat{Q}'_\alpha(t) - Q'_\alpha(t)))^\top$. A key component to derive Bahadur representation for $\hat{\theta}_{\alpha,n}(s)$ is to study the oscillation behavior of the associated weighted empirical process of form (16). Recall that Bahadur (1966) also analyzed oscillations of empirical processes and obtained asymptotic expansions of sample quantiles of i.i.d. data.

Let $\mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t) = (1, (i/n - t)/b_n)^\top$. For $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$, define

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{\alpha,n}(t, \theta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_\alpha(X_i - Q_\alpha(t) - (i/n - t)Q'_\alpha(t) - \theta^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)) \\ &\quad \times K_{b_n}(i/n - t) \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Write $S_{\alpha,n}(t) = S_{\alpha,n}(t, \mathbf{0})$, where $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0)^\top$. Let $\mu_{\mathbf{K}} = \text{diag}(1, \mu_2)$ be a 2×2 diagonal matrix. We need the following regularity conditions:

(B1) Assume that, for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, $F_k(t, x, \Upsilon_i) := \partial^k F(t, x, \Upsilon_i) / \partial x^k$ exists and the family $\{F_k(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable, where $F_0(t, x, \Upsilon_i) = F(t, x, \Upsilon_i)$.

(B2) There exists $C_0 < \infty$ such that $\sup_{(t,x) \in [0,1] \times \mathbb{R}} F_1(t, x, \Upsilon_i) < C_0$ almost surely.

(B3) $f(t, x)$ is Lipschitz continuous on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$.

THEOREM 2 (Local uniform Bahadur representation). *Let $0 < t < 1$. Assume that $f(t, Q_\alpha(t)) > 0$, $nb_n / \log^2 n \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_n \rightarrow 0$. Then under (A1), (B1)–(B3), we have*

$$(17) \quad \sup_{s \in B_n(t)} \left| f(s, Q_\alpha(s)) \mu_{\mathbf{K}} \hat{\theta}_{\alpha,n}(s) - \frac{S_{\alpha,n}(s)}{nb_n} \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\frac{\varrho_n^{1/2} \log n}{\sqrt{nb_n}} + b_n \varrho_n + \varrho_n^2 \right),$$

where $B_n(t) = [t - b_n, t + b_n] \cap [0, 1]$ and $\varrho_n = (nb_n)^{-1/2} \log n + b_n^2$.

THEOREM 3 (Global uniform Bahadur representation). *Let $T_n = [b_n, 1 - b_n]$. Assume (A1), (B1)–(B3), $\inf_{t \in [0,1]} f(t, Q_\alpha(t)) > 0$, $nb_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_n \rightarrow$*

0. Then

$$(18) \quad \sup_{t \in T_n} \left| f(t, Q_\alpha(t)) \mu_{\mathbf{K}} \hat{\theta}_{\alpha,n}(t) - \frac{S_{\alpha,n}(t)}{nb_n} \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\frac{\pi_n^{1/2} \log n}{\sqrt{nb_n}} + b_n \pi_n + \pi_n^2 \right),$$

where $\pi_n = (nb_n)^{-1/2}(\log n + (b_n)^{-1/2} + (nb_n^5)^{1/2})$.

Bahadur representations in Theorems 2 and 3 are useful for studying asymptotic properties of the estimated quantile curves by providing asymptotic approximation of $\hat{\theta}_{\alpha,n}(t)$. The local Bahadur representation of Theorem 2 is needed in proving consistency and asymptotic normality for a two-step smoother given in Section 3.3. By Remark 1 in Section 6, Theorem 3 implies global uniform consistency of the estimated quantile curves. We believe that, with the uniform Bahadur representation (18), one can construct simultaneous confidence bands for $Q_\alpha(t)$ over $t \in T_n$ based on a Gaussian approximation of $\{S_{\alpha,n}(t), t \in T_n\}$; see Wu and Zhao (2007) for simultaneous inference of mean trends in time series.

3.3. *Two-stage smoothing and jackknife.* The estimated curve $\hat{Q}_\alpha(t)$ may not be smooth and thus is visually unattractive. To remedy this problem, we suggest a second-stage local linear smoothing

$$(19) \quad \check{Q}_\alpha(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{Q}_\alpha(i/n) w_n(t, i),$$

where $w_n(t, i) = K_{\bar{b}_n}(t - i/n)[\mathcal{B}_2(t) - (t - i/n)\mathcal{B}_1(t)]/[\mathcal{B}_2(t)\mathcal{B}_0(t) - \mathcal{B}_1^2(t)]$ are the local linear weights, $\mathcal{B}_j(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n (t - i/n)^j K_{\bar{b}_n}(t - i/n)$ and \bar{b}_n is another bandwidth; see Fan and Gijbels (1996), page 20, for the validation of the local linear weights. Fan and Zhang (2000) applied a two-step procedure to improve the unsmooth raw estimates. Introducing another smoothing step may possibly bring extra bias and variance. However, fortunately, if the bandwidth \bar{b}_n satisfies $\bar{b}_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$, then the extra bias and variance are negligible compared to those of the original quantile estimator $\hat{Q}_\alpha(t)$. The simulation study in Draghicescu, Guillas and Wu (2008) suggests that the second-stage smoothing can make the raw estimate visually attractive. However the latter paper does not provide theoretical justification of the validity of the procedure. Theorem 4 presents properties of the estimator (19). The key tool for proving the theorem is the local Bahadur representation (17).

THEOREM 4. *Assume $\bar{b}_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$, $n\bar{b}_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $nb_n^5 = O(1)$. Under conditions of Theorem 2, we have*

$$(20) \quad \sqrt{nb_n} f(t, Q_\alpha(t)) [\check{Q}_\alpha(t) - Q_\alpha(t)] - T_{\alpha,n}(t) / \sqrt{nb_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Hence

$$(21) \quad \sqrt{nb_n}[\check{Q}_\alpha(t) - Q_\alpha(t) - b_n^2\mu_2Q''_\alpha(t)/2] \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(t)\phi_K/f^2(t, Q_\alpha(t))).$$

To construct confidence intervals for $Q_\alpha(t)$ based on (21), one may need to estimate Q''_α , which appears highly nontrivial. To circumvent the latter problem, we shall propose a bias-corrected estimate. Let $K^*(u) = 2K(u) - 2^{-1/2}K(u/\sqrt{2})$ and

$$T_{\alpha,n}^*(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_\alpha(X_i - Q_\alpha(t) - Q'_\alpha(t)(i/n - t))K_{b_n}^*(i/n - t).$$

By the argument in (61), we have $\mathbb{E}(T_{\alpha,n}^*(t)) = o(nb_n^3)$ since $\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 K^*(u) du = 0$. Let

$$(22) \quad \tilde{Q}_{\alpha,b_n}(t) := 2\check{Q}_{\alpha,b_n}(t) - \check{Q}_{\alpha,\sqrt{2}b_n}(t).$$

A similar jackknife-type bias corrected estimate is proposed in [Wu and Zhao \(2007\)](#) for inference of trends in mean nonstationary models. By (20) and following Proposition 6, we have under conditions of Theorem 4 that

$$(23) \quad \begin{aligned} \sqrt{nb_n}[\tilde{Q}_{\alpha,b_n}(t) - Q_\alpha(t)] &= \frac{T_{\alpha,n}^*(t)}{\sqrt{nb_n}} + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &\Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(t)\phi_{K^*}/f^2(t, Q_\alpha(t))). \end{aligned}$$

With (22) and (23), to construct confidence intervals for $Q_\alpha(t)$, we can just use $\tilde{Q}_{\alpha,b_n}(t)$ and do not need to estimate the bias term $b_n^2\mu_2Q''_\alpha(t)/2$ in (21).

3.4. Estimation of the density and variance functions. To construct confidence intervals based on Theorems 1 and 4, we should deal with the nontrivial problem of estimating the long-run variance function $\sigma^2(t)$ and the density $f(t, Q_\alpha(t))$. By the local stationarity property, we can estimate them by using observations X_i for which i/n is close to t .

For $t \in (0, 1)$, let $s_n(t) = \max(\lfloor nt - nb_n \rfloor, 1)$, $l_n(t) = \min(\lfloor nt + nb_n \rfloor, n)$ and

$$(24) \quad \mathcal{N}_n(t) = \{i \in \mathbb{N} : s_n(t) \leq i \leq l_n(t)\}.$$

Let $Z_{i,\alpha} = \psi_\alpha(X_i - \hat{Q}_\alpha(i/n))$. For a sequence m_n with $m_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $nb_n/m_n \rightarrow \infty$, let

$$(25) \quad \hat{\sigma}^2(t) = \frac{m_n}{|\mathcal{N}_n(t)| - m_n + 1} \sum_{j=s_n(t)}^{l_n(t)-m_n+1} \left(\frac{1}{m_n} \sum_{i=j}^{j+m_n-1} Z_{i,\alpha} - \bar{Z}_n(t) \right)^2,$$

where $\bar{Z}_n(t) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} Z_{i,\alpha} / |\mathcal{N}_n(t)|$ and $|\mathcal{N}_n(t)| = l_n(t) - s_n(t) + 1$ is the cardinality of $\mathcal{N}_n(t)$. Estimator (25) is a localized version of the popular

block estimate of the long-run variance. For stationary processes, properties of long-run variance estimates have been extensively studied; see, for example, [Politis, Romano and Wolf \(1999\)](#).

For $f(t, Q_\alpha(t))$, we propose the following version of the kernel density estimator

$$(26) \quad \hat{f}(t, Q_\alpha(t)) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_n(t)|h_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} K_{h_n}^\#(\hat{Q}_\alpha(t) - X_i),$$

where $K^\# \in \mathcal{K}$ is a kernel and h_n is the bandwidth satisfying $h_n \rightarrow 0$ and $nb_n \times h_n \rightarrow \infty$. [Theorem 5](#) asserts consistency of both estimators. Its proof is sketched in [Section 6](#).

THEOREM 5. *Under conditions of [Theorem 2](#), for any $t \in (0, 1)$, $\hat{\sigma}^2(t)$ and $\hat{f}(t, Q_\alpha(t))$ are weakly consistent estimators for $\sigma^2(t)$ and $f(t, Q_\alpha(t))$, respectively.*

Choosing optimal smoothing parameters m_n and h_n is highly nontrivial as it involves the issue of nonstationarity as well as dependence. As a rule of thumb, we recommend using $m_n = \lambda_* |\mathcal{N}_n(t)|^{1/3}$, where λ_* can be obtained based on [Song \(1996\)](#), and $h_n = c_* |\mathcal{N}_n(t)|^{-1/5}$, where c_* is chosen by using the bandwidth selector of [Sheather and Jones \(1991\)](#). Those smoothing parameter selectors perform reasonably well for stationary and short-range dependent processes. Since locally (X_i) can be well approximated by a stationary process as the window size $b_n \rightarrow 0$, it is expected that those selectors are also applicable under our setting.

4. Examples. In this section we present examples of locally stationary linear and nonlinear time series. For such processes, the stability of $F_k(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)$ as well as the local stationarity conditions can be verified. Hence, results in [Section 3](#) are applicable.

4.1. Nonstationary linear processes. Let ε_i be i.i.d. random variables; let $a_j(\cdot), j = 0, 1, \dots$, be $\mathcal{C}^1[0, 1]$ functions such that

$$(27) \quad G(t, \Upsilon_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j(t) \varepsilon_{i-j}$$

is well defined for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Model [\(27\)](#) was considered in [Dahlhaus \(1997\)](#), where his primary interest is to estimate time-varying spectra.

[Propositions 2](#) and [3](#) are for checking the stability condition and the stochastic Lipschitz continuity condition (A3), respectively. They are closely related the example in [Section 2.1](#) in [Draghicescu, Guillas and Wu \(2008\)](#).

Here for the sake of completeness we provide rigorous and explicit statements. Let F_ε be the distribution function of ε_i and f_ε be its density. For $k = 0, 1, \dots$, denote by $g^{(k)}(\cdot)$ the k th derivative of $g(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Here $g^{(0)} = g$.

PROPOSITION 2. *Assume that $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathcal{L}^q$, $q > 0$, and its density $f_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ satisfies*

$$(28) \quad \sup_x |f_\varepsilon^{(k)}(x)| < C_0, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, 3,$$

for some $C_0 < \infty$. Further assume $\min_{t \in [0,1]} |a_0(t)| > 0$. Let $q' = \min(2, q)$. Then $\delta_{F_k}(i) = O(\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |a_i(t)|^{q'/2})$. Hence $\{F_k(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable if $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |a_j(t)|^{q'/2} < \infty$.

PROOF. We first assume $a_0(t) \equiv 1$. Let $\underline{G}(t, \Upsilon_{i-1}) = G(t, \Upsilon_i) - \varepsilon_i$ and $\underline{G}(t, \Upsilon_{i-1}^*) = \underline{G}(t, \Upsilon_{i-1}) - a_i(t)\varepsilon_0 + a_i(t)\varepsilon_0'$. Using $\min(1, |x|) \leq |x|^{q'/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{F_k}(i) &= \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \|F_\varepsilon^{(k)}(u - \underline{G}(t, \Upsilon_{i-1})) - F_\varepsilon^{(k)}(u - \underline{G}(t, \Upsilon_{i-1}^*))\| \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \min\{2C_0, C_0 \|a_i(t)\varepsilon_0 - a_i(t)\varepsilon_0'\|\} \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} 2C_0 \| |a_i(t)\varepsilon_0 - a_i(t)\varepsilon_0'|^{q'/2} \| = O\left(\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |a_i(t)|^{q'/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The case in which $a_0(t) \not\equiv 1$ can be similarly dealt with by using the argument in Section 2.1 in Draghicescu, Guillas and Wu (2008). \square

PROPOSITION 3. *Assume that $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathcal{L}^q$, $q > 0$. Then condition (A3) holds with this q if*

$$(29) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |a_j'(t)|^{\min(2,q)} < \infty.$$

Note that $\zeta_i(t) - \zeta_i(s) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} [a_j(t) - a_j(s)]\varepsilon_{i-j}$. Using the Lebesgue Dominant Convergence Theorem and similar arguments as those in the proof of Proposition 2, Proposition 3 easily follows. Details are omitted. Note that both propositions allow heavy-tailed processes $\{X_i\}$.

4.2. Nonstationary nonlinear time series. Let ε_i be i.i.d. Many stationary nonlinear time series models are of the form

$$(30) \quad Z_i = R(Z_{i-1}, \varepsilon_i),$$

where R is a measurable function [Wu and Shao (2004)]. A natural extension of (30) to the locally stationary setting is to incorporate the time index t via

$$(31) \quad \zeta_i(t) = R(t, \zeta_{i-1}(t), \varepsilon_i), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

Theorem 6 asserts that, under suitable conditions, (31) has a unique stationary solution of the form $\zeta_i(t) = G(t, \Upsilon_i)$. Then one can have a nonstationary process $X_{i,n} = G(i/n, \Upsilon_i)$.

THEOREM 6. *Let $q > 0$. Assume that, for some x_0 , $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|R(t, x_0, \varepsilon_i)\|_q < \infty$, and*

$$(32) \quad \chi := \sup_{t \in [0,1]} L(t) < 1, \quad \text{where } L(t) = \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{\|R(t, x, \varepsilon_0) - R(t, y, \varepsilon_0)\|_q}{|x - y|}.$$

Then for any $t \in [0, 1]$, (31) admits a unique stationary solution, and iterations of (31) lead to $\zeta_i(t) = G(t, \Upsilon_i)$. Furthermore, we have

$$(33) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|G(t, \Upsilon_i) - G(t, \Upsilon_i^*)\|_q = O(\chi^i).$$

Theorem 6 follows from the argument of Theorem 2 in Wu and Shao (2004). We omit the proof since there is no essential extra difficulties involved. By the Markovian structure of $(\zeta_i(t))$, we can write $F(t, x, \Upsilon_i) = F(t, x, \zeta_i(t))$. Let $\dot{F}_k(t, x, u) = \partial F_k(t, x, u) / \partial u$ if the latter exists. The following corollary is immediate [cf. Proposition 5 in Wu (2007a)].

COROLLARY 2. *Assume that conditions of Theorem 6 hold. Further assume*

$$(34) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x,u} |\dot{F}_k(t, x, u)| + \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{x,u} |F_k(t, x, u)| < \infty, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

Then we have $\delta_{F_k}(i) = O(\chi_1^i)$ for some $\chi_1 \in (0, 1)$. Hence $\{F_k(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable.

PROPOSITION 4. *Under conditions of Theorem 6, we have (A3) provided that*

$$(35) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|M(G(t, \Upsilon_0))\|_q < \infty,$$

$$\text{where } M(x) = \sup_{0 \leq t < s \leq 1} \frac{\|R(t, x, \varepsilon_0) - R(s, x, \varepsilon_0)\|_q}{|t - s|}.$$

PROOF. We only consider the case $q \geq 1$. The case $q < 1$ similarly follows. From the proof of Theorem 2 in [Wu and Shao \(2004\)](#), we have $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|G(t, \Upsilon_0)\|_q < \infty$. Let $C_1 = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|M(G(t, \Upsilon_0))\|_q$ and $\chi = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} L(t) < 1$. For $t, s \in [0, 1]$, by [\(32\)](#),

$$\|R(s, \zeta_{i-1}(t), \varepsilon_i) - R(s, \zeta_{i-1}(s), \varepsilon_i)\|_q \leq \chi \|\zeta_{i-1}(t) - \zeta_{i-1}(s)\|_q.$$

Hence, by [\(35\)](#), $\|\zeta_i(t) - \zeta_i(s)\|_q \leq C_1 |t - s| + \chi \|\zeta_i(t) - \zeta_i(s)\|_q$. So (A3) follows. \square

EXAMPLE 1 (Time varying threshold autoregressive (TVTAR) models). Let $\varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{L}^q$, $q > 0$, be i.i.d. with distribution function F_ε and density $f_\varepsilon = F'_\varepsilon$. Consider the model

$$(36) \quad \zeta_i(t) = a(t)[\zeta_{i-1}(t)]^+ + b(t)[- \zeta_{i-1}(t)]^+ + \varepsilon_i, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1,$$

where $a(t), b(t) \in \mathcal{C}^1[0, 1]$. Then Theorem 6 is applicable if $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} [|a(t)| + |b(t)|] < 1$. Since $F(t, x, u) = F_\varepsilon(x - a(t)u^+ - b(t)(-u)^+)$, we have [\(34\)](#) if there exists a constant $C < \infty$, such that $\sup_u |f_\varepsilon^{(k)}(u)| < C$, $k = 0, \dots, 3$. Since $a(t), b(t) \in \mathcal{C}^1[0, 1]$, [\(35\)](#) holds. Note that, similarly as the linear process case, (X_i) can be heavy-tailed.

5. Data analysis. Climate change has received enormous attention. The understanding of changes in trends, variability and extremes of climate is of great importance. See Contribution of Working Group I to the fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Solomon et al. (2007) (WGI07 hereafter) for a comprehensive discussion.

The local linear quantile smoothing technique is a useful approach to studying changes in trends and variability of nonstationary time series by examining quantile curves, for example, the median and IQR curves. As pointed out in WGI07, extremes are infrequent events at the high and low ends of the range of values of a particular variable. Hence, upper and lower quantile curves such as $Q_{0.95}(t)$ and $Q_{0.05}(t)$ are natural tools for illustrating changes in climate extremes.

Robust tools such as quantile methods have already been applied in the climatology community. See, for instance, [Hannachi \(2006\)](#). However, previous literature is mostly for stationary or integrated linear time series models. Additionally, Gaussian or other specific distributional assumptions were typically made. These assumptions are vulnerable to model misspecifications, which may lead to erroneous conclusions. Here we shall apply our method to climate data sets and compare our findings with previous ones.

5.1. *Global temperature data.* Global warming is one of the most important issues in climate change and it is closely related to the changes of other climate variables (sea level, for instance). Global temperature series have been extensively studied in the statistics community; see, for example, Bloomfield and Nychka (1992), Vogelsang (1998), Wu, Woodroffe and Mentz (2001) and Wu and Zhao (2007), among others. Most of the above studies focused on estimation and inference of trends (mean functions). Less statistical research has been done with respect to changes in variability and extremes of global temperatures.

Here we consider the series compiled by Jones et al.; see <http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/ftp/trends/temp/jonescru/>. It contains global monthly temperature anomalies from 1856 to 2005, relative to the 1961–1990 mean; see left panel of Figure 2 for the data. We study the median, 95% and 5% extreme quantile and IQR curves. Jackknife bias correction and two-stage smoothing are applied. We tried both the static bandwidth (15) and the time-varying $b_n(\alpha, t)$. Both choices of bandwidths yield quite similar results. Hence here we present our results by using the static bandwidth. For the 0.05th, 0.25th, 0.5th, 0.75th and 0.95th quantile curves, the bandwidths are chosen as 0.083, 0.077, 0.075, 0.077 and 0.089, respectively. The bandwidth for the second-stage smoothing step is 0.04. The estimated curves and corresponding asymptotic 95% point-wise confidence bands are shown in Figure 1.

From the estimated median curve, we see a clear warming trend. Interestingly, the increasing of temperature is not homogenous, with a strong faster warming trend after 1975. Wu and Zhao (2007) rejected the hypothesis of linear increasing of trend. Our estimated median curve is consistent with the mean temperature curve in Figure TS.6 in WGI07. Similar trends of significant nonhomogenous increase are found in both 5% and 95% quantile curves of monthly temperature (although 95% quantile curve seems to slightly decrease after 1995). As summarized in WGI07,

“Changes in extremes of temperature are consistent with warming. Observations show widespread reductions in the number of frost days in mid-latitude regions, increases in the number of warm extremes (warmest 10% of days or nights) and a reduction in the number of daily cold extremes (coldest 10% of days or nights).”

Note that the magnitude of increase of the 5% quantile is approximately twice that of the 95% quantile, indicating reduction in the temperature variability. This result is consistent with the statement in *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* [IPCC (2001), WGI01 hereafter], that while increases in the frequency of warm days have been observed, decreases in the number of cool nights have been stronger. Reduction in the variability can be verified by the IQR curve. Compared with the width of the confidence




FIG. 1. Trends in median, extreme quantiles and IQR of the global monthly temperature series, with 95% point-wise confidence bands.

band, the reduction of variability is not as significant as the increasing of median and extreme quantiles. In Chapter 2 of WGI01 several climatological papers were cited to confirm that annual and monthly variation of global temperature had decreased. To summarize, although based on different statistical models and assumptions, results of our method are consistent with the previous empirical findings. Our results suggest that global monthly temperature distribution in the last 150 years has the tendency of shifting to the right with shrinking variability.

5.2. *U.S. precipitation data.* This data set contains spatially averaged monthly total precipitation in the land surface of United States from January 1895 to April 2007. It is available at National Climate Data Center's website at <http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cirs/drd964x.pcpst.txt>. One can refer to <http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cirs/state.README> for a detailed description.

Average seasonal trend was first removed from the data and we focus on inference of the anomalies; the right panel of Figure 2 summarizes the anomalies. Jackknife bias correction and two-stage smoothing are applied. We also choose the static bandwidth (15) since the time-varying bandwidths




FIG. 2. Time series plots of the data examples. Left panel: global warming data. Right panel: U.S. precipitation data.

provide similar estimated curves. For the 0.05th, 0.25th, 0.5th, 0.75th and 0.95th quantile curves, the bandwidths are chosen as 0.114, 0.096, 0.096, 0.096 and 0.115, respectively. The bandwidth for the second-stage smoothing step is chosen as 0.05. The estimated median, extreme quantile and IQR curves and corresponding asymptotic 95% point-wise confidence bands are shown in Figure 3.

In theory, increased temperature is likely to produce heavier precipitation. As stated in WGI01,

“Increasing global surface temperatures are very likely to lead to changes in precipitation and atmospheric moisture, because of changes in atmospheric circulation, a more active hydrological cycle, and increases in the water holding capacity throughout the atmosphere.”

However, the estimated median curve shows that even though there is a slight increase of the monthly precipitation, noticeably after 1960, the trend is not significant with respect to its stochastic uncertainty. WGI01 suggested to compare changes in many of the moisture-related variables, such as streamflow and soil moisture, with precipitation to help validate long-term precipitation trends and claimed that the precipitation change was not




FIG. 3. Trends in median, extreme quantiles and IQR of monthly U.S. precipitation, with 95% point-wise confidence bands.

spatially uniform. On the other hand, one factor which could be considered is the so-called “global dimming” effect [see, e.g., Stanhill and Cohen (2001), Roderick and Farquhar (2002), Liepert et al. (2004), among others], which reduces the sun radiation and water evaporation on the surface and therefore reduces precipitation. Hence future research taking into account of those factors may help confirm (or reject) the heavier precipitation hypothesis. Both WGI07 and WGI01 claimed that there was an amplified increase of heavy precipitation, even in regions where the mean precipitation decreased. Our estimated 95% quantile curve does show a stronger increase than the mean, but still not very impressive considering the width of the confidence band. The 5% quantile and IQR curves also show no significant increase or decrease pattern. To summarize, the U.S. monthly precipitation data does not show significant increasing trend of precipitation median and heavy precipitation, as reported in the literature and a more comprehensive study including more factors may be helpful.

6. Proof of results in Section 3. Unless otherwise specified, we will only prove results in Section 3 for $\alpha = 1/2$, since results for other quantiles similarly follow. We shall also omit the subscript α in the notation if no confusion

will be caused. Here we list some notation that we will use in this section. Let $Y_i(t) = X_i - Q(t) - (i/n - t)Q'(t)$, $\check{Y}_i(t) = G(t, \Upsilon_i) - Q(t)$, $\check{e}_i(t) = \psi(\check{Y}_i(t))$ and $\check{S}_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \check{e}_i(t) \mathbf{v}_{i,n}(t)$, where $\mathbf{v}_{i,n}(t) = K_{b_n}(i/n - t) \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)$. Recall $\mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t) = (1, (i/n - t)/b_n)^\top$.

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define the projection operator \mathcal{P}_k on \mathcal{L}^1 , by $\mathcal{P}_k \cdot = \mathbb{E}(\cdot | \Upsilon_k) - \mathbb{E}(\cdot | \Upsilon_{k-1})$. Recall $J(t, x, \Upsilon_i) = I\{G(t, \Upsilon_i) \leq x\}$. Let $i \geq 1$. Then $\mathbb{E}(J(t, x, \Upsilon_i) | \Upsilon_0) = \mathbb{E}(F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}) | \Upsilon_0)$ and $\mathbb{E}(J(t, x, \Upsilon_i) | \Upsilon_{-1}) = \mathbb{E}(F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}) | \Upsilon_{-1})$. Since $\varepsilon'_0, \varepsilon_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, are independent, we have $\mathbb{E}(F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}) | \Upsilon_{-1}) = \mathbb{E}(F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}^*) | \Upsilon_{-1})$ and $\mathbb{E}(F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}^*) | \Upsilon_{-1}) = F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}^*) | \Upsilon_0$. Hence

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{P}_0 J(t, x, \Upsilon_i)\| &= \|\mathbb{E}(F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}) - F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}^*) | \Upsilon_0)\| \\ &\leq \|F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}) - F(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}^*)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{F(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable, by (5), $\sigma(t)$ in (7) is finite.

LEMMA 1. *Let $b_n \rightarrow 0$; let $(\alpha_{ni})_{i=1}^n$ be a triangular array of real numbers such that*

$$(38) \quad A_n(t) := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ni}^2 K_{b_n}^2(i/n - t) \leq C,$$

and $\varpi_n := \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} |\alpha_{ni}| \rightarrow 0$. Assume (A1), (A2) and that $\{F(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable. Let $\eta_{ni}(t) = [\rho(Y_i(t) - \alpha_{ni}) - \rho(Y_i(t)) + \alpha_{ni} \psi(Y_i(t))] K_{b_n}(i/n - t)$. Then $\text{var}[\sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{ni}(t)] \rightarrow 0$.

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{A} = [\inf_{t \in [0,1]} Q(t) - 1, \sup_{t \in [0,1]} Q(t) + 1]$. For every $k \geq 1$, sufficiently small ϵ_0 and sufficiently large n , we have by (37) that, for $|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_0$,

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{SUP} \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}[\psi(Y_i(t) - \epsilon) - \psi(Y_i(t))]\| &\leq \text{SUP} 2 \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k} \psi(Y_i(t) - \epsilon)\| \\ &\leq 2\delta_F(k-1), \end{aligned}$$

where SUP denotes $\sup_{|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_0} \sup_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)}$. On the other hand, for sufficiently small ϵ_0 and sufficiently large n , by condition (A2),

$$(40) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{SUP} \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}[\psi(Y_i(t) - \epsilon) - \psi(Y_i(t))]\| \\ \leq \text{SUP} \|\psi(Y_i(t) - \epsilon) - \psi(Y_i(t))\| \\ \leq \left(\epsilon_0 \max_{(t,x) \in [0,1] \times \mathcal{A}} f(t, x) \right)^{1/2} \leq C \epsilon_0^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $Z_{k,n}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{i-k}[\psi(Y_i(t) - s\alpha_{ni}) - \psi(Y_i(t))] \alpha_{ni} K_{b_n}(i/n - t)$. Since the summands of $Z_{k,n}(s)$ are martingale differences, by (38), (39) and (40),

we have, for large n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \|Z_{k,n}(s)\|^2 &= \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}[\psi(Y_i(t) - s\alpha_{ni}) - \psi(Y_i(t))]\|^2 \\
(41) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\times \alpha_{ni}^2 K_{b_n}^2(i/n - t) \\
&\leq C \min\{\delta_F^2(k-1), \varpi_n\}
\end{aligned}$$

holds for $k \geq 1$. Clearly, $\sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \|Z_{0,n}(s)\|^2 \leq C \min(1, \varpi_n)$. Since $\{F(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}$ is stable, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \delta_F(k-1) < \infty$. By the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n [\eta_{mi}(t) - \mathbb{E}\eta_{mi}(t)] \right\| &= \left\| - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{s=0}^1 Z_{k,n}(s) ds \right\| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{s=0}^1 \|Z_{k,n}(s)\| ds \\
(42) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq C \min(1, \varpi_n) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C \min\{\delta_F(k-1), \varpi_n^{1/2}\} \\
&\rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in view of $\varpi_n \rightarrow 0$. \square

LEMMA 2. Assume (A1), (A2) and $b_n \rightarrow 0$. Then for all large n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} |\mathbb{E}[\rho(Y_i(t) + a) - \rho(Y_i(t)) - a\psi(Y_i(t))] - f(t, Q(t))a^2/2| \\
(43) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= o(a^2) \quad \text{as } a \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tau = a/T$. Since $\rho(x)$ is convex, for all $j = 1, \dots, T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau[\psi(Y_i(t) + j\tau - \tau) - \psi(Y_i(t))] \\
(44) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq \rho(Y_i(t) + j\tau) - \rho(Y_i(t) + j\tau - \tau) - \psi(Y_i(t))\tau \\
&\leq \tau[\psi(Y_i(t) + j\tau) - \psi(Y_i(t))].
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation, using (A2), summing over $j = 1, \dots, T$, and then letting $T \rightarrow \infty$, we have (43). \square

Before we proceed to the next proposition, let us first observe that the original estimation problem (3) is equivalent to the following transformed one:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\vartheta}(t) &:= (\hat{\vartheta}_1(t), \hat{\vartheta}_2(t))^\top \\
(45) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \arg \min_{\vartheta} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(Y_i(t) - \vartheta^\top \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t)) K_{b_n}(i/n - t),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$(46) \quad \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t) := (u_{i,n,1}(t), u_{i,n,2}(t))^\top = \Sigma_n(t)^{-1/2} (1, (i/n - t)/b_n)^\top,$$

and $\Sigma_n(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n (1, (i/n - t)/b_n)^\top (1, (i/n - t)/b_n) K_{b_n}(i/n - t)$. Since $K \in \mathcal{K}$, we have $\Sigma_n(t) = nb_n \mu_{\mathbf{K}} + O(1)$ uniformly on any closed interval of $(0, 1)$.

The estimators $(\hat{Q}(t), \hat{Q}'(t))^\top$ of (3) and $\hat{\vartheta}(t)$ are related via

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\vartheta}_1(t) &= \Sigma_n(t)^{1/2} (\hat{Q}(t) - Q(t)) \quad \text{and} \\ \hat{\vartheta}_2(t) &= \Sigma_n(t)^{1/2} b_n (\hat{Q}'(t) - Q'(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Recall $\hat{\theta}(t) = (\hat{Q}(t) - Q(t), b_n(\hat{Q}'(t) - Q'(t)))^\top$ and (16) for $S_n(t)$.

PROPOSITION 5. *Assume (A1), (A2), $b_n \rightarrow 0$, $nb_n \rightarrow \infty$, $f(t, Q(t)) > 0$ and that $\{F(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable. Then*

$$(48) \quad f(t, Q(t)) \Sigma_n(t) \hat{\theta}(t) - S_n(t) = o_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{1/2}).$$

PROOF. For a fixed vector $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^2$, let $\alpha_{ni} = \vartheta^\top \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t)$. Then $\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} |\alpha_{ni}| \rightarrow 0$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t) \mathbf{u}_{i,n}^\top(t) K_{b_n}(i/n - t) = Id_2$, where Id_2 is the 2×2 identity matrix. Let $\varpi_i(t) = \rho(Y_i(t) - \vartheta^\top \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t)) - \rho(Y_i(t)) + \vartheta^\top \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t) \psi(Y_i(t))$. By Lemma 2, we have

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\varpi_i(t) K_{b_n}(i/n - t)] &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} f(t, Q(t)) \frac{(\vartheta^\top \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t))^2}{2} \\ &\quad \times (1 + o(1)) K_{b_n}(i/n - t) \\ &= \frac{f(t, Q(t)) |\vartheta|^2}{2} + o(|\vartheta|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $K \in \mathcal{K}$, by simple calculations, (38) holds. Thus by Lemma 1 and (49), we have

$$(50) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \varpi_i(t) K_{b_n}(i/n - t) \rightarrow \frac{f(t, Q(t)) |\vartheta|^2}{2} \quad \text{in probability.}$$

Note that both sides of (50) are convex functions of ϑ . By the Convexity Lemma in Pollard (1991), page 187, we have that the above convergence holds uniformly for $|\vartheta| \leq c$, where $c > 0$ is a finite constant. Now the relation (48) easily follows from properties of convex functions; see, for example, the proofs of Theorem 1 in Wu (2007a), Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 in Bai, Rao and Wu (1992) or Theorem 1 in Pollard (1991). Details are omitted. \square

LEMMA 3. *Let $\check{V}_n(t) = \text{cov}(\check{S}_n(t))$ and $\nu_{\mathbf{K}} = \text{diag}(\int_{-1}^1 K^2(u) du, \int_{-1}^1 u^2 \times K^2(u) du)$. Suppose that $\{F(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable, $b_n \rightarrow 0$ and $nb_n \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$(51) \quad (nb_n)^{-1} \check{V}_n(t) \rightarrow \sigma^2(t) \nu_{\mathbf{K}}.$$

PROOF. For simplicity we write \check{e}_i etc for $\check{e}_i(t)$. Clearly $(\check{e}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stationary and $\mathbb{E}(\check{e}_i) = 0$. Let $D_i = \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_i \check{e}_j$ and $R_i = \check{e}_i - D_i$. Recall (24) for $\mathcal{N}_n(t)$. Let $s_n = s_n(t)$, $l_n = l_n(t)$, $A_i = \sum_{j=s_n}^{s_n+i} (\check{e}_j - D_j)$ and $B_n = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} D_i \mathbf{v}_{i,n}$. By the summation by parts formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\check{S}_n(t) - B_n\| &= \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} R_i \mathbf{v}_{i,n} \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{l_n - s_n - 1} \|A_i\| |\mathbf{v}_{i,n} - \mathbf{v}_{i+1,n}| + \|A_{l_n - s_n}\| |\mathbf{v}_{l_n - s_n, n}|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Omega_m = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \delta_F(k-1)$. By (3) of Theorem 1 in Wu (2007b), we have

$$\omega_n := \max_{0 \leq i \leq l_n - s_n} \|A_i\|^2 \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{l_n - s_n} \Omega_j^2 = o(l_n - s_n) = o(nb_n)$$

since $\Omega_m \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$(52) \|\check{S}_n(t) - B_n\| \leq \omega_n^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{l_n - s_n - 1} |\mathbf{v}_{i,n} - \mathbf{v}_{i+1,n}| + |\mathbf{v}_{l_n - s_n, n}| \right) = o((nb_n)^{1/2}).$$

Note that D_i are martingale differences. By orthogonality, since $K \in \mathcal{K}$, it is easily seen that $(nb_n)^{-1} \mathbb{E}(B_n B_n^\top) \rightarrow \sigma^2(t) \nu_{\mathbf{K}}$. Hence, by (52), we have (51). \square

LEMMA 4. *Under conditions of Lemma 3 and assuming $\sigma(t) > 0$, we have*

$$(53) \quad (nb_n)^{-1/2} \check{S}_n(t) \Rightarrow \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2(t) \nu_{\mathbf{K}}).$$

PROOF. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\tilde{e}_{m,i} = \mathbb{E}(\check{e}_i | \Upsilon_{i-m,i})$, where, for $j \leq k$, $\Upsilon_{j,k} = (\varepsilon_j, \varepsilon_{j+1}, \dots, \varepsilon_k)$. Here we also write \check{e}_i etc for $\check{e}_i(t)$. Then $(\tilde{e}_{m,i})_{i=1}^n$ is m -dependent. Elementary calculations show that $\mathcal{P}_{i-k} \tilde{e}_{m,i} = \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{P}_{i-k} \check{e}_i | \Upsilon_{i-m,i})$. Thus, we have for sufficiently large n ,

$$\sup_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}(\check{e}_i - \tilde{e}_{m,i})\| \leq 2 \sup_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k} \check{e}_i\| \leq 2\delta_F(k-1).$$

On the other hand, by the stationarity of (\check{e}_i) ,

$$\sup_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}(\check{e}_i - \tilde{e}_{m,i})\| \leq \sup_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} \|\check{e}_i - \tilde{e}_{m,i}\| = \|\check{e}_0 - \tilde{e}_{m,0}\| := \tau_J(m).$$

Clearly $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tau_J(m) = 0$. By the orthogonality,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{i-k}(\check{e}_i - \tilde{e}_{m,i}) \mathbf{v}_{i,n} \right\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \mathcal{P}_{i-k}(\check{e}_i - \tilde{e}_{m,i}) \right\|^2 |\mathbf{v}_{i,n}|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(54) \quad & \leq \min\{\tau_J^2(m), \delta_F^2(k-1)\} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{v}_{i,n}|^2 \\
& \leq C n b_n \min\{\tau_J^2(m), \delta_F^2(k-1)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Write $\tilde{S}_{m,n}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{e}_{m,i} \mathbf{v}_{i,n}$. Then $\check{S}_n(t) - \tilde{S}_{m,n}(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{i-k}(\check{e}_i - \tilde{e}_{m,i}) \mathbf{v}_{i,n}$. Let LIM denote $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty}$. Since $\{F(\cdot, \cdot, \Upsilon_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stable, as (42), by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
(55) \quad & \text{LIM} \frac{\|\check{S}_n(t) - \tilde{S}_{m,n}(t)\|}{(n b_n)^{1/2}} \\
& = \text{LIM} \frac{\|\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{i-k}(\check{e}_i - \tilde{e}_{m,i}) \mathbf{v}_{i,n}\|}{(n b_n)^{1/2}} \\
& \leq \text{LIM} (n b_n)^{-1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{i-k}(\check{e}_i - \tilde{e}_{m,i}) \mathbf{v}_{i,n} \right\| \\
& \leq \text{LIM} \left[C \min(1, \tau_J(m)) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C \min\{\tau_J(m), 2\delta_F(k-1)\} \right] \\
& \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

For a symmetric matrix A let $\lambda(A)$ be its smallest eigenvalue. Let $\tilde{V}_{m,n}(t) = \text{cov}(\tilde{S}_{m,n}(t))$. By (55) and Lemma 3, $\text{LIM} |\sigma^2(t) \nu_{\mathbf{K}} - (n b_n)^{-1} \tilde{V}_{m,n}(t)| = 0$. Note that $\sigma^2(t) \nu_{\mathbf{K}}$ is nonsingular. Thus there exists an $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c_0 > 0$ such that for $m \geq m_0$ and for all large n , $(n b_n)^{-1} \lambda(\tilde{V}_{m,n}(t)) > c_0$. Note that $(\tilde{e}_{m,i})$ are m -dependent. Applying the Cramer–Wold device and the central limit theorem for m -dependent random variables [see [Hoeffding and Robbins \(1948\)](#)], we have $\tilde{V}_{m,n}^{-1/2}(t) [\tilde{S}_{m,n}(t) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{S}_{m,n}(t)] \Rightarrow N(0, Id_2)$ for fixed $m \geq m_0$. Thus by (55), we obtain (53). \square

PROPOSITION 6. *Under conditions of Theorem 1, we have*

$$(56) \quad (n b_n)^{-1/2} [S_n(t) - \mathbb{E} S_n(t)] \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(t) \nu_{\mathbf{K}}).$$

PROOF. First note that

$$(57) \quad \sup_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}(e_i - \check{e}_i)\| \leq \sup_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} (\|\mathcal{P}_{i-k} e_i\| + \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k} \check{e}_i\|) \leq 2\delta_F(k-1).$$

Let n be sufficiently large and $\epsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small. Then for $i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}(e_i - \check{e}_i)\| \\
& \leq \|e_i - \check{e}_i\| \\
& \leq \|(e_i - \check{e}_i) I\{|\zeta_i(i/n) - \zeta(t)| \geq \epsilon\}\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \|(e_i - \check{e}_i)I\{|\zeta_i(i/n) - \zeta_i(t)| < \epsilon\}\| \\
& \leq \|I\{|\zeta_i(i/n) - \zeta_i(t)| \geq \epsilon\}\| + \|I\{|\zeta_i(t) - Q(t)| < Q'(t)b_n + \epsilon\}\| \\
& \leq \epsilon^{-q/2} \|\zeta_i(i/n) - \zeta(t)\|_q^{q/2} + (2Q'(t)b_n + 2\epsilon)^{1/2} f^*(t, \epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where $f^*(t, \epsilon) = \sup\{f(t, x) : x \in (Q(t) - Q'(t)b_n - \epsilon, Q(t) + Q'(t)b_n + \epsilon)\}$. Let $\epsilon = b_n^{2/3}$. By (A2), (A3) and the above inequality, we have

$$(58) \quad \|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}(e_i - \check{e}_i)\| \leq C[|i/n - t|^{q/2}/b_n^{q/3} + (b_n^{2/3})^{1/2}] \leq Cb_n^{\min(1/3, q/6)}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)$. Hence by (57) and (58), we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{i-k}(e_i - \check{e}_i)\| \leq \min\{2\delta_F(k-1), Cb_n^{\min(1/3, q/6)}\}.$$

Note that $b_n \rightarrow 0$. Using the same argument for (42), we have

$$(59) \quad \|S_n(t) - \mathbb{E}S_n(t) - \check{S}_n(t)\| = o((nb_n)^{1/2}).$$

Now by Lemma 4, (56) holds. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Clearly Proposition 5 implies (6). By Proposition 5, we have

$$(60) \quad f(t, Q(t))\mu_{\mathbf{K}}(nb_n)^{1/2}\hat{\theta}(t) - \frac{[S_n(t) - \mathbb{E}S_n(t)]}{(nb_n)^{1/2}} - \frac{\mathbb{E}S_n(t)}{(nb_n)^{1/2}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

By (A1), (A2) and Taylor's expansions, since $\alpha = F(i/n, Q(i/n))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(61) \quad \mathbb{E}S_n(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^n [F(i/n, Q(i/n)) - F(i/n, Q(t) + Q'(t)(i/n - t))] \mathbf{v}_{i,n}(t) \\
&= nb_n^3 f(t, Q(t)) Q''(t) (1 + o(1)) (\mu_2, 0)^\top / 2 + o(nb_n^3).
\end{aligned}$$

By (60), (61) and Proposition 6, we have (8) in view of $nb_n^5 = O(1)$ and

$$(62) \quad (nb_n)^{1/2} f(t, Q(t)) [\mu_{\mathbf{K}} \hat{\theta}(t) - b_n^2 Q''(t) (\mu_2, 0)^\top / 2] \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(t) \nu_{\mathbf{K}}). \quad \square$$

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1. By (6), we have

$$\sqrt{nb_n} [\hat{Q}_\alpha(t) - Q_\alpha(t)] - \frac{T_{\alpha,n}(t)}{\sqrt{nb_n} f(t, Q_\alpha(t))} [1 + O((nb_n)^{-1})] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Applying the above relation with $\alpha = 0.75$ and $\alpha = 0.25$, we have (9) by using the arguments in the proofs of Theorem 1 and Proposition 6. \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1. We shall first prove (ii). A careful check of the proofs of Lemmas 1, 2 and Proposition 5 implies that they are also valid for $t = 0$, and (48) becomes

$$(63) \quad f(0, Q(0)) \Sigma_n(0) \hat{\theta}(0) - S_n(0) = o_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{1/2}).$$

Also Lemmas 3, 4 and Proposition 6 are still valid with $\nu_{\mathbf{K}}$ therein replaced by the 2×2 matrix $\nu_{\mathbf{K}}^0 = (\varphi_{|j-j'|})_{1 \leq j, j' \leq 2}$, where $\varphi_j = \int_0^1 u^j K^2(u) du$. By (A1), (A2) and Taylor's expansions, since $K \in \mathcal{K}$, with elementary calculations, (61) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}S_n(0) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nb_n \rfloor} [F(i/n, Q(i/n)) - F(i/n, Q(0) + Q'(0)i/n)] \mathbf{v}_{i,n}(0) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n [Q(i/n) - (Q(0) + Q'(0+)i/n)] f(i/n, Q(i/n)) \\
(64) \quad &\quad \times (1 + o(1)) K_{b_n}(i/n) \mathbf{v}_{i,n}(0) \\
&= \frac{nb_n^3}{2} f(0, Q(0)) Q''(0+) (1 + o(1)) \begin{pmatrix} \int_0^1 u^2 K(u) du \\ \int_0^1 u^3 K(u) du \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Additionally, since $K \in \mathcal{K}$, $\Sigma_n(0)/(nb_n) \rightarrow \Gamma$, where Γ is a 2×2 matrix with its (j, j') th entry being $\int_0^1 u^{|j-j'|} K(u) du$, $1 \leq j, j' \leq 2$. Hence, by (63), $f(0, Q(0)) \hat{\theta}(0) - \Sigma_n^{-1}(0) S_n(0) = o_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{-1/2})$. As in the proof of Theorem 1, the latter relation implies (12) by Slutsky's theorem and (64), since $(nb_n)^{-1/2} [S_n(0) - \mathbb{E}S_n(0)] \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(0) \nu_{\mathbf{K}}^0)$.

We now prove (i). Let $\varphi_n := \sum_{i=1}^n K_{b_n}(i/n) = (nb_n)/2 + O(1)$ and $\Delta_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(X_i - Q(0)) K_{b_n}(i/n)$. Using the argument in the proof of Proposition 5, we have the following analogous version of (63):

$$(65) \quad f(0, Q(0)) \varphi_n (\bar{Q}(0) - Q(0)) - \Delta_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{1/2}).$$

Similarly as Proposition 6, the CLT $[\Delta_n - \mathbb{E}(\Delta_n)]/\sqrt{nb_n} \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(0) \varphi_0)$ holds. As (64),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\Delta_n) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nb_n \rfloor} [F(i/n, Q(i/n)) - F(i/n, Q(0))] K_{b_n}(i/n) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n [Q(i/n) - Q(0)] f(i/n, Q(i/n)) (1 + o(1)) K_{b_n}(i/n) \\
&= nb_n^2 f(0, Q(0)) Q'(0+) (1 + o(1)) \mu_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence (11) holds by elementary manipulations. \square

We will only prove Theorem 3 in this section since Theorem 2 can be proved by using the same technique. Let

$$M_n(t, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{\psi(Y_i(t) - \theta^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t))\}$$

$$(66) \quad -\mathbb{E}[\psi(Y_i(t) - \theta^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)) | \Upsilon_{i-1}] \mathbf{v}_i(t),$$

where $\mathbf{v}_i(t) = (v_{i,1}(t), v_{i,2}(t))^\top = K_{b_n}(i/n - t)(1, (i/n - t)/b_n)^\top$, and

$$(67) \quad N_n(t, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \mathbb{E}[\psi(Y_i(t) - \theta^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)) | \Upsilon_{i-1}] - \mathbb{E}\psi(Y_i(t) - \theta^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)) \} \mathbf{v}_i(t).$$

Then

$$S_n(t, \theta) - \mathbb{E}S_n(t, \theta) = M_n(t, \theta) + N_n(t, \theta).$$

Note that the summands of $M_n(t, \theta)$ form a martingale difference sequence while summands of $N_n(t, \theta)$ are differentiable with respect to t and θ ; see Lemmas 5 and 6 below. Decomposing $S_n(t, \theta) - \mathbb{E}S_n(t, \theta)$ into a martingale part and a differentiable part is useful for studying its oscillatory behavior. The technique in Wu (2007a) is useful.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. Let $\mathcal{S}_n(t, \theta) = \mathbb{E}S_n(t, \theta)$ and $\mathcal{S}_n(t) = \mathbb{E}S_n(t)$. For $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in T_n, |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |S_n(t, \theta) - \mathcal{S}_n(t, \theta) - [S_n(t) - \mathcal{S}_n(t)]| \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{1/2}(\gamma_n^{1/2} \log n + \gamma_n b_n^{-1/2}) + n^{-3}) \end{aligned}$$

in view of Lemmas 5 and 6. By Lemma 7 below, we have

$$(68) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in T_n} |S_n(t, \hat{\theta}(t)) - \mathcal{S}_n(t, \hat{\theta}(t)) - [S_n(t) - \mathcal{S}_n(t)]| \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{1/2}(\pi_n^{1/2} \log n + \pi_n b_n^{-1/2})). \end{aligned}$$

Elementary calculations using (B1), (B3) and Lemma 7 show that

$$(69) \quad \sup_{t \in T_n} |\mathcal{S}_n(t, \hat{\theta}(t)) - \mathcal{S}_n(t) + nb_n f(t, Q(t)) \mu_{\mathbf{K}} \hat{\theta}(t)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(nb_n^2 \pi_n + nb_n \pi_n^2).$$

Since $(nb_n)^{1/2} \pi_n b_n^{-1/2} = O(nb_n \pi_n^2)$, by (68), (69) and Lemma 8, Theorem 3 follows. \square

LEMMA 5. Let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be positive with $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$. Under conditions of Theorem 3, we have

$$(70) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1], |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |M_n(t, \theta) - M_n(t, 0)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n \gamma_n)^{1/2} \log n + n^{-3}).$$

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{N}_n(t-) = (0, nt] \cap \mathcal{N}_n(t)$ and $\mathcal{N}_n(t+) = (nt, n] \cap \mathcal{N}_n(t)$. Define

$$\eta_i(t, \theta) = \psi(Y_i(t) - \theta^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)) - \mathbb{E}[\psi(Y_i(t) - \theta^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)) | \Upsilon_{i-1}].$$

Write $M_{n,1}(t, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i(t, \theta) v_{i,1}(t)$, $M_{n,2}(t, \theta) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t+)} \eta_i(t, \theta) v_{i,2}(t)$ and $M_{n,3}(t, \theta) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t-)} \eta_i(t, \theta) v_{i,2}(t)$. Since $M_n(t, \theta) = (M_{n,1}(t, \theta), \sum_{j=2}^3 M_{n,j}(t, \theta))^\top$, it suffices to prove (70) with M_n therein replaced by $M_{n,j}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. For presentation clarity we consider $j = 2$. The other two cases can be similarly dealt with.

For a real sequence $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \infty$ with $g_n \geq 3$ for all n , define $u_n = (nb_n \gamma_n)^{1/2} g_n / \log g_n$, $\phi_n = (nb_n \gamma_n)^{1/2} g_n \log n$, $a_i(t, \theta) = \psi(Y_i(t) - \theta^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)) \times v_{i,2}(t)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} A_n(t) &= \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t+)} \sup_{|\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |a_i(t, \theta) - a_i(t, 0)|, \\ U_n(t) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t+)} \mathbb{E}\{\psi(Y_i(t) + |\mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)| \gamma_n) \\ &\quad - \psi(Y_i(t) - |\mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)| \gamma_n)\}^2 | \Upsilon_{i-1} \} v_{i,2}^2(t). \end{aligned}$$

By the monotonicity of $\psi(\cdot)$,

$$(71) \quad \sup_{|\theta| \leq \gamma_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t+)} \mathbb{E}[(\eta_i(t, \theta) - \eta_i(t, 0))^2 v_{i,2}^2 | \Upsilon_{i-1}] \leq U_n(t).$$

By (B2), (B3) and since $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$, it is easy to see that, for sufficiently large n ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} U_n(t) \right] \leq 3nb_n \gamma_n c_0 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(t,x) \in [0,1] \times \mathbb{R}} F_1(t, x, \Upsilon_{i-1}) \right] \leq Cnb_n \gamma_n,$$

where $c_0 = \int_{-1}^1 K^2(u) u^2 (1+u^2)^{1/2} du < \infty$. Hence by Markov's Inequality,

$$(72) \quad \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} U_n(t) \geq u_n^2 \right] \leq u_n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} U_n(t) \right] = O(g_n^{-1} \log g_n) = o(1).$$

Similarly, using $A_n(t) \leq \sup_{|\theta| \leq \gamma_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t+)} |a_i(t, \theta) - a_i(t, 0)|$, we have

$$(73) \quad \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} A_n(t) \geq u_n \right] = o(1).$$

Let $l = n^9$, $\mathcal{G}_l = \{(k_1/l, k_2/l) : |k_1|, |k_2| \leq n^9; k_i \in \mathbb{Z}, i = 1, 2\} \cap \{[-\gamma_n, \gamma_n] \times [-\gamma_n, \gamma_n]\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_l = \{k_3/l : 0 \leq k_3 \leq n^9; k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Then $\mathcal{G}_l \times \mathcal{H}_l$ has at most $27n^{27}$ points.

By the argument in the proof of Lemma 4 in Wu (2007a), we obtain in view of Freedman's (1975) exponential inequality for martingale differences that

$$(74) \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{G}_l, t \in \mathcal{H}_l} |M_{n,2}(t, \theta) - M_{n,2}(t, 0)| \geq 2\phi_n, \right. \\ \left. \sup_{t \in [0,1]} A_n(t) \leq u_n, \sup_{t \in [0,1]} U_n(t) \leq u_n^2 \right\} \\ \leq 27n^{27} O[\exp\{-\phi_n^2/(4u_n\phi_n + 2u_n^2)\}].$$

Since $4u_n\phi_n \log n = o(\phi_n^2)$ and $2u_n^2 \log n = o(\phi_n^2)$, (72), (73) and (74) imply

$$(75) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{G}_l, t \in \mathcal{H}_l} |M_{n,2}(t, \theta) - M_{n,2}(t, 0)| \geq 2\phi_n \right\} = 0.$$

Next we shall apply a chaining argument. For $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$, define $[\mathbf{x}]_l := ([x_1]_l, [x_2]_l)^\top$ and $\lceil \mathbf{x} \rceil_l := (\lceil x_1 \rceil_l, \lceil x_2 \rceil_l)^\top$, where $[u]_l = \lfloor ul \rfloor / l$ and $\lceil u \rceil_l = \lceil ul \rceil / l$. Let $\theta \in [-\gamma_n, \gamma_n] \times [-\gamma_n, \gamma_n]$. Since $\psi(\cdot)$ is nondecreasing, we have

$$(76) \quad a_i(t, \lceil \theta \rceil_l) \leq a_i(t, \theta) \leq a_i(t, \lfloor \theta \rfloor_l) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{H}_l \text{ and } i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t+).$$

Let $L_i = \sup_{(t,x) \in [0,1] \times \mathbb{R}} F_1(t, x, \Upsilon_i)$ and $V_n = \sum_{i=1}^n L_{i-1}$. Let $|s_1|, |s_2| \leq \gamma_n$. By (B2), for all large n and $i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t+)$, $|\mathbb{E}[(\psi(Y_i(t) - s_1) - \psi(Y_i(t) - s_2)) | \Upsilon_{i-1}]| \leq L_{i-1}|s_1 - s_2|$. Since $|\theta - \lceil \theta \rceil_l| = O(l^{-1})$, we have

$$(77) \quad \sup_{|\theta| \leq \gamma_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t+)} |\mathbb{E}\{[a_i(t, \theta) - a_i(t, \lceil \theta \rceil_l)] | \Upsilon_{i-1}\}| \leq Cl^{-1}V_n.$$

The same inequality holds if we replace $\lceil \theta \rceil_l$ by $\lfloor \theta \rfloor_l$. Therefore, for all $|\theta| \leq \gamma_n$,

$$M_{n,2}(t, \lceil \theta \rceil_l) - M_{n,2}(t, 0) - Cl^{-1}V_n \leq M_{n,2}(t, \theta) - M_{n,2}(t, 0) \\ \leq M_{n,2}(t, \lfloor \theta \rfloor_l) - M_{n,2}(t, 0) + Cl^{-1}V_n.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}(V_n) \leq Cn$, $l^{-1}V_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-4})$. Since $g_n \rightarrow \infty$ can be arbitrarily slow, we have

$$(78) \quad \sup_{t \in \mathcal{H}_l, |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |M_{n,2}(t, \theta) - M_{n,2}(t, 0)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n\gamma_n)^{1/2} \log n + n^{-4}).$$

Let $t_k = k/l$, $k = 0, \dots, l$. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$(79) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1], |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |M_{n,2}(t, \theta) - M_{n,2}(t, 0)| \\ \leq \max_{0 \leq k \leq l-1} \sup_{0 < t - t_k < l^{-1}, |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |M_{n,2}(t, \theta) - M_{n,2}(t_k, \theta)| \\ + \sup_{t \in \mathcal{H}_l, |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |M_{n,2}(t, \theta) - M_{n,2}(t, 0)|.$$

By the similar chaining argument as those in the proof of (78) as well as the fact that $F_1(t, x, \Upsilon_i)$ is bounded on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$(80) \quad \max_{0 \leq k \leq l-1} \sup_{0 < t - t_k < l^{-1}, |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |M_{n,2}(t, \theta) - M_{n,2}(t_k, \theta)| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-3}).$$

By (80), (78) and (79), the lemma follows. \square

LEMMA 6. *Under conditions of Lemma 5, we have*

$$(81) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1], |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |N_n(t, \theta) - N_n(t, 0)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{1/2} \gamma_n).$$

PROOF. Let $\Pi_n = \sup_{t \in [0, 1], |\theta| \leq \gamma_n} |N_n(t, \theta) - N_n(t, 0)|$. By (B1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_n(t, \theta) - N_n(t, 0) &= \int_0^{\theta_1} \int_0^{\theta_2} \frac{\partial^2 N_n(t, (u, v)^\top)}{\partial u \partial v} du dv \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\theta_1} \frac{\partial N_n(t, (u, 0)^\top)}{\partial u} du \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\theta_2} \frac{\partial N_n(t, (0, v)^\top)}{\partial v} dv \\ &=: \int_0^{\theta_1} \int_0^{\theta_2} \tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u}) du dv \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\theta_1} \tilde{N}_2(t, u) du + \int_0^{\theta_2} \tilde{N}_3(t, v) dv, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u, v)^\top$. Hence,

$$(82) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi_n &\leq \int_{-\gamma_n}^{\gamma_n} \int_{-\gamma_n}^{\gamma_n} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u})| du dv + \int_{-\gamma_n}^{\gamma_n} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\tilde{N}_2(t, u)| du \\ &\quad + \int_{-\gamma_n}^{\gamma_n} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\tilde{N}_3(t, v)| dv. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\tau_i = i b_n$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, \tilde{b}_n$ and $\tau_i = 1$ for $i = \tilde{b}_n + 1$, where $\tilde{b}_n = \lfloor b_n^{-1} \rfloor$. By the triangle inequality, for $\mathbf{u} \in [-\gamma_n, \gamma_n] \times [-\gamma_n, \gamma_n]$, we have

$$(83) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u})| &\leq \max_{0 \leq i \leq \tilde{b}_n + 1} |\tilde{N}_1(\tau_i, \mathbf{u})| + \max_{1 \leq i \leq \tilde{b}_n + 1} Z_i(\mathbf{u}), \quad \text{where} \\ Z_i(\mathbf{u}) &= \sup_{\tau_{i-1} < t < \tau_i} |\tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u}) - \tilde{N}_1(\tau_i, \mathbf{u})|. \end{aligned}$$

By (B1) and the differentiability of $Q(t), Q'(t), \mathbf{v}_i(t), \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)$, we conclude that $\tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u})$ is differentiable with respect to t . Furthermore, simple calculations show that

$$(84) \quad \frac{d\tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u})}{dt} = \sum_{k=2}^3 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} [R_{k,n}(i, t, \mathbf{u}) - \mathbb{E}(R_{k,n}(i, \mathbf{u}, t))] \mathbf{w}_{k,n}(i, t, \mathbf{u}),$$

where $R_{k,n}(i, \mathbf{u}, t) = F_k(i/n, Q(t) + (i/n - t)Q'(t) + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}, \Upsilon_{i-1})$ and $\mathbf{w}_{k,n}(i, t, \mathbf{u})$ satisfies

$$(85) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{|\mathbf{u}| \leq \gamma_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} |\mathbf{w}_{k,n}(i, t, \mathbf{u})|^2 = O(n/b_n), \quad k = 2, 3.$$

Using (85), (B1) and similar arguments as those in the proof of Lemma 1, we have

$$(86) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{|\mathbf{u}| \leq \gamma_n} \left\| \frac{d\tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u})}{dt} \right\| = O((n/b_n)^{1/2}).$$

By (86), we have for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \tilde{b}_n + 1$

$$(87) \quad \|Z_i(\mathbf{u})\| \leq \int_{\tau_i - b_n}^{\tau_i} \left\| \frac{d\tilde{N}_1(s, \mathbf{u})}{ds} \right\| ds = O((nb_n)^{1/2}).$$

Since $\max_{1 \leq i \leq \tilde{b}_n + 1} |Z_i(\mathbf{u})|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{b}_n + 1} |Z_i(\mathbf{u})|^2$, we have

$$(88) \quad \left\| \max_{1 \leq i \leq \tilde{b}_n + 1} |Z_i(\mathbf{u})| \right\| = O((nb_n)^{1/2} (1/b_n)^{1/2}) = O(n^{1/2}).$$

Similarly, $\| \max_{0 \leq i \leq \tilde{b}_n + 1} |\tilde{N}_1(\tau_i, \mathbf{u})| \| = O(n^{1/2})$. By (83), we conclude

$$\left\| \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u})| \right\| = O((nb_n)^{1/2} (1/b_n)^{1/2}) = O(n^{1/2}).$$

Same inequality holds with $\tilde{N}_1(t, \mathbf{u})$ herein replaced by $\tilde{N}_2(t, u)$ or $\tilde{N}_3(t, v)$. Thus by (82), $\|\Pi_n\| = O((nb_n)^{1/2} \gamma_n (1/b_n)^{1/2}) = O(n^{1/2} \gamma_n)$ and this lemma follows. \square

LEMMA 7. Recall $\hat{\theta}(t) = [\hat{Q}(t) - Q(t), b_n(\hat{Q}'(t) - Q'(t))]^\top$ and $\pi_n = (nb_n)^{-1/2} [\log n + (b_n)^{-1/2} + (nb_n^5)^{1/2}]$. Under conditions of Theorem 3, we have $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\hat{\theta}(t)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\pi_n)$.

PROOF. By (47), it suffices to show that

$$(89) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\hat{\vartheta}(t)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n)^{1/2} \pi_n) := O_{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{\pi}_n),$$

where we recall (45) for $\hat{\vartheta}(t)$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_n(t, \vartheta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n [\rho(Y_i(t) - \vartheta^\top \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t)) - \rho(Y_i(t))] K_{b_n}(i/n - t), \\ \Xi_n(t, \vartheta) &= \Lambda_n(t, \vartheta) + \sum_{i=1}^n \vartheta^\top \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t) \psi(Y_i(t)) K_{b_n}(i/n - t) \end{aligned}$$

$$(90) \quad \begin{aligned} &:= \Lambda_n(t, \vartheta) + \vartheta^\top \Psi_n(t), \\ \tilde{\Xi}_n(t, \vartheta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n [\psi(Y_i(t) - \vartheta^\top \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t)) - \psi(Y_i(t))] \mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t) K_{b_n}(i/n - t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_{i,n}(t)$ is defined in (46). Let γ_n be a positive sequence such that

$$(91) \quad \gamma_n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_n (nb_n)^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Using the same martingale part and differentiable part decomposition technique applied in Lemmas 5 and 6, we can show that

$$(92) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{|\vartheta| \leq \gamma_n} |\tilde{\Xi}_n(t, \vartheta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Xi}_n(t, \vartheta)| \\ &= O_{\mathbb{P}}(\gamma_n^{1/2} (nb_n)^{-1/4} \log n + \gamma_n (nb_n)^{-1/2} b_n^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(93) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\Psi_n(t) - \mathbb{E}[\Psi_n(t)]| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\log n + (b_n)^{-1/2}).$$

On the other hand, simple calculations show that $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mathbb{E}[\Psi_n(t)]| = O_{\mathbb{P}}((nb_n^5)^{1/2})$. Together with (93) we conclude that

$$(94) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\Psi_n(t)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{\pi}_n).$$

Furthermore, using the similar arguments as those in the proof of Lemma 2 and (49), it is easy to see that for γ_n satisfying (91)

$$(95) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{|\vartheta| \leq \gamma_n} |\mathbb{E}[\Xi_n(t, \vartheta)] - f(t, Q(t))|\vartheta|^2/2| = o(\gamma_n^2).$$

Note $\Xi_n(t, \vartheta) = -\vartheta^\top \int_0^1 \tilde{\Xi}_n(t, s\vartheta) ds$. Relation (92) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{|\vartheta| \leq \gamma_n} |\Xi_n(t, \vartheta) - \mathbb{E} \Xi_n(t, \vartheta)| &\leq \gamma_n \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{|\vartheta| \leq \gamma_n} |\tilde{\Xi}_n(t, \vartheta) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\Xi}_n(t, \vartheta)| \\ &= o_{\mathbb{P}}(\gamma_n^2), \end{aligned}$$

which by (95) implies

$$(96) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sup_{|\vartheta| \leq \gamma_n} \left| \Xi_n(t, \vartheta) - \frac{1}{2} f(t, Q(t))|\vartheta|^2 \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(\gamma_n^2).$$

For a sequence $\{c_n\}$ with $c_n \rightarrow \infty$, let $c'_n = \min\{c_n, (\pi_n)^{-1/2}\}$. Then $c'_n \rightarrow \infty$. It is easy to see that $\bar{\gamma}_n = c'_n \bar{\pi}_n$ satisfies (91). On the other hand, if $|\vartheta| = \bar{\gamma}_n$, we have by (94) that $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\vartheta^\top \Psi_n(t)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(c'_n \bar{\pi}_n^2)$. Since $\inf_{t \in [0,1]} f(t, Q_\alpha(t)) > 0$, by (96), we have

$$(97) \quad \mathbb{P} \left[\inf_{t \in [0,1]} \inf_{|\vartheta| = \bar{\gamma}_n} \Lambda_n(t, \vartheta) \leq 0 \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that $\Lambda_n(t, \vartheta)$ is convex in ϑ and $\Lambda_n(t, 0) = 0$. Hence for any ϑ such that $|\vartheta| > \bar{\gamma}_n$, we have $\Lambda_n(t, \vartheta) \geq (|\vartheta|/\bar{\gamma}_n)\Lambda_n(t, \bar{\gamma}_n\vartheta/|\vartheta|)$. By (97), $\mathbb{P}[\inf_{t \in [0,1]} \inf_{|\vartheta| \geq \bar{\gamma}_n} \Lambda_n(t, \vartheta) \leq 0] \rightarrow 0$. By the definition of $\hat{\vartheta}(t)$, we have $\mathbb{P}[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\hat{\vartheta}(t)| \geq c'_n \bar{\pi}_n] \rightarrow 0$. Since $c_n \rightarrow \infty$ can be arbitrarily slow, (89) follows. \square

REMARK 1. Note that under conditions of Theorem 3, $\pi_n \rightarrow 0$. Hence Lemma 7 implies that $\hat{Q}(t)$ is a uniformly consistent estimator of $Q(t)$ on $[0, 1]$. Additionally, if $nb_n^4 \rightarrow \infty$, then $\hat{Q}'(t)$ is also uniformly consistent for $Q'(t)$ on $[0, 1]$.

LEMMA 8. Under (B2), $\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |S_n(t, \hat{\theta}(t))| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

PROOF. From the proof of Corollary 2 in Wu (2007a) or Lemma A.2 in Ruppert and Carroll (1980), it is easy to see that

$$(98) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |S_n(t, \hat{\theta}(t))| \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{v}_i(t)| I\{X_i = \hat{\mathbf{Q}}(t)^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)\},$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}(t) = (\hat{Q}(t), b_n \hat{Q}'(t))$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{v}_i(t)| I\{X_i = \hat{\mathbf{Q}}(t)^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)\} \\ & \leq C \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sum_{i=1}^n I\{X_i = \hat{\mathbf{Q}}(t)^\top \mathbf{z}_{i,n}(t)\} \\ & = C \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \sum_{i=1}^n I\{X_i = \hat{Q}(t) - t\hat{Q}'(t) + \hat{Q}'(t)i/n\} \\ & \leq C \sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{i=1}^n I\{X_i = a_1 + a_2 i/n\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2)^\top$. Following Babu (1989) and using (B2), we see that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{i=1}^n I\{X_i = a_1 + a_2 i/n\} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Therefore this lemma follows. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 4. It suffices to prove (20). By (17), we have

$$\sqrt{nb_n} \left[\check{Q}_\alpha(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n w_n(t, i) Q_\alpha(i/n) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_n(t, i) T_{\alpha, n}(i/n)}{f(i/n, Q_\alpha(i/n)) \sqrt{nb_n}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Since $\sup_{|s-t| \leq \bar{b}_n} |T_{\alpha,n}(s)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(nb_n \varrho_n)$, $\sum_{i=1}^n w_n(t, i) Q_{\alpha}(i/n) - Q_{\alpha}(t) = O(\bar{b}_n^2)$ and, by (B1)–(B3), $\sup_{|i/n-t| \leq \bar{b}_n} |1/f(i/n, Q_{\alpha}(i/n)) - 1/f(t, Q_{\alpha}(t))| = O(\bar{b}_n)$, we have

$$\sqrt{nb_n} f(t, Q_{\alpha}(t)) [\check{Q}_{\alpha}(t) - Q_{\alpha}(t)] - \sum_{i=1}^n w_n(t, i) T_{\alpha,n}(i/n) / \sqrt{nb_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

(99)

Basic manipulations similar as those in the proof of Proposition 6 show that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_n(t, i) \frac{T_{\alpha,n}(i/n) - T_{\alpha,n}(t) - \mathbb{E}\{T_{\alpha,n}(i/n) - T_{\alpha,n}(t)\}}{\sqrt{nb_n}} \right\| = o(\bar{b}_n/b_n).$$

(100)

Since $K \in \mathcal{K}$, it is easily seen that $\sup_{|i/n-t| \leq \bar{b}_n} |\mathbb{E}\{T_{\alpha,n}(i/n) - T_{\alpha,n}(t)\}| = o(\sqrt{nb_n})$. Combining (99) and (100), we have (20). \square

OUTLINE OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 5. From the proofs of Lemmas 5 and 6, we can obtain $\sup_{s \in \mathcal{N}_n(t)} |\hat{Q}_{\alpha}(s) - Q_{\alpha}(s)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\varrho_n)$. Using the martingale decomposition technique therein, it can be shown that, if we replace the estimates $\hat{Q}(i/n)$ and $\hat{Q}(t)$ in (25) and (26) by the true values $Q(i/n)$ and $Q(t)$, the changes of (25) and (26) will be of order $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. By the property of local stationarity, the same conclusion holds when we further replace $Z_{i,\alpha}$ and X_i in (25) and (26) by $\check{e}_i = \psi_{\alpha}(\check{X}_i - Q(t))$ and $\check{X}_i = G(t, \Upsilon_i)$, respectively. Applying convergence results for the stationary processes $\{\check{e}_i\}$ and $\{\check{X}_i\}$, Theorem 5 follows. A detailed proof is available upon request. \square

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to three referees, the associate editor and the editor for their many helpful comments.

REFERENCES

- ABBERGER, K. (1997). Quantile smoothing methods in financial time series. *Statist. Papers* **28** 125–148. [MR1475190](#)
- ABBERGER, K. and HEILER, S. (2002). Nonparametric quantile regression with applications to financial time series. In *Statistical Data Analysis based on the L1-Norm and Related Methods* (Y. Dodge, ed.) 149–160. Birkhäuser, Basel. [MR2001311](#)
- BABU, G. J. (1989). Strong representations for LAD estimators in linear models. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **83** 547–558. [MR1022629](#)
- BAHADUR, R. R. (1966). A note on quantiles in large samples. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **37** 577–580. [MR0189095](#)
- BAI, Z. D., RAO, C. R. and WU, Y. (1992). M -estimation of multivariate linear regression parameters under a convex discrepancy function. *Statist. Sinica* **2** 237–254. [MR1152307](#)
- BHATTACHARYA, P. K. and GANGOPADHYAY, A. K. (1990). Kernel and nearest neighbour estimation of a conditional quantile. *Ann. Statist.* **18** 1400–1412. [MR1062716](#)
- BLOOMFIELD, P. and NYCHKA, D. (1992). Climate spectra and detecting climate change. *Climatic Change* **21** 275–287.

- BOX, G. E. P., JENKINS, G. M. and REINSEL, G. C. (1994). *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ. [MR1312604](#)
- CAI, Z. (2002). Regression quantiles for time series data. *Econom. Theory* **18** 169–192. [MR1885356](#)
- CAI, Z. and XU, X. (2005). Nonparametric quantile estimations for dynamic smooth coefficient models. Unpublished manuscript.
- CHAUDHURI, P. (1991). Nonparametric estimates of regression quantiles and their local Bahadur representation. *Ann. Statist.* **19** 760–777. [MR1105843](#)
- CHENG, C. and PARZEN, E. (1997). Unified estimators of smooth quantile and quantile density functions. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **59** 291–307. [MR1450503](#)
- CSÖRGŐ, S. and MIELNICZUK, J. (1996). The empirical process of a short-range dependent stationary sequence under Gaussian subordination. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **104** 15–25. [MR1367664](#)
- DAHLHAUS, R. (1997). Fitting time series models to non-stationary processes. *Ann. Statist.* **25** 1–37. [MR1429916](#)
- DRAGHICESCU, D., GUILLAS, S. and WU, W. B. (2008). Quantile curve estimation and visualization for non-stationary time series. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.* To appear.
- FAN, J. and GIJBELS, I. (1996). *Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications*. Chapman & Hall, London. [MR1383587](#)
- FAN, J. and YAO, Q. (2003). *Nonlinear Time Series, Nonparametric and Parametric Methods*. Springer, New York. [MR1964455](#)
- FAN, J. and ZHANG, J. T. (2000). Two-step estimation of functional linear models with applications to longitudinal data. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **62** 303–322. [MR1749541](#)
- FREEDMAN, D. A. (1975). On tail probabilities for martingales. *Ann. Probab.* **3** 100–118. [MR0380971](#)
- GIURCANU, M. and SPOKOINY, V. (2004). Confidence estimation of the covariance function of stationary and locally stationary processes. *Statist. Decisions* **22** 283–300. [MR2158265](#)
- GHOSH, S. and DRAGHICESCU, D. (2002a). Predicting the distribution function for long-memory processes. *Int. J. Forecast.* **18** 283–290.
- GHOSH, S. and DRAGHICESCU, D. (2002b). An algorithm for optimal bandwidth selection for smooth nonparametric quantiles and distribution functions. In *Statistical Data Analysis based on the L1-Norm and Related Methods* (Y. Dodge, ed.) 161–168. Birkhäuser, Basel. [MR2001312](#)
- GHOSH, S., BERAN, J. and INNES, J. (1997). Nonparametric conditional quantile estimation in the presence of long memory. *Student* **2** 109–117.
- HANNACHI, A. (2006). Quantifying changes and their uncertainties in probability distribution of climate variables using robust statistics. *Climate Dynamics* **27** 301–317.
- HE, X. and SHAO, Q. M. (1996). A general Bahadur representation of M-estimators and its application to linear regression with nonstochastic designs. *Ann. Statist.* **24** 2608–2630. [MR1425971](#)
- HOEFFDING, W. and ROBBINS, H. (1948). The central limit theorem for dependent random variables. *Duke Math. J.* **15** 773–780. [MR0026771](#)
- IPCC (2001). *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (J. T. Houghton, Y. Ding, D. J. Griggs, M. Noguer, P. J. van der Linden, X. Dai, K. Maskell and C. A. Johnson, eds.). Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- KOENKER, R. (2005). *Quantile regression*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge. [MR2268657](#)

- LIEPERT, B. G., FEICHTER, J., LOHMANN, U. and ROECKNER, E. (2004). Can aerosols spin down the water cycle in a warmer and moister world? *Geophysical Research Letters* **31** L06207.
- MALLAT, S., PAPANICOLAOU, G. and ZHANG, Z. (1998). Adaptive covariance estimation of locally stationary processes. *Ann. Statist.* **26** 1–47. [MR1611808](#)
- NASON, G. P., VON SACHS, R. and KROISANDT, G. (2000). Wavelet processes and adaptive estimation of the evolutionary wavelet spectrum. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **62** 271–292. [MR1749539](#)
- OMBAO, H., VON SACHS, R. and GUO, W. (2005). SLEX analysis of multivariate nonstationary time series. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **100** 519–531. [MR2160556](#)
- POLITIS, D. N., ROMANO, J. P. and WOLF, M. (1999). *Subsampling*. Springer, New York. [MR1707286](#)
- POLLARD, D. (1991). Asymptotics for least absolute deviation regression estimators. *Econom. Theory* **7** 186–199. [MR1128411](#)
- PRIESTLEY, M. B. (1988). *Nonlinear and Nonstationary Time Series Analysis*. Academic Press, London. [MR0991969](#)
- RODERICK, M. L. and FARQUHAR, G. D. (2002). The cause of decreased pan evaporation over the past 50 years. *Science* **298** 1410–1411.
- RUPPERT, D. and CARROLL, R. J. (1980). Trimmed least squares estimation in the linear model. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **75** 828–838. [MR0600964](#)
- SHEATHER, S. J. and JONES, M. C. (1991). A reliable data-based bandwidth selection method for kernel density estimation. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **53** 683–690. [MR1125725](#)
- SOLOMON, S., QIN, D., MANNING, M., ALLEY, R. B., BERNTSEN, T., BINDOFF, N. L., CHEN, Z., CHIDTHAISONG, A., GREGORY, J. M., HEGERL, G. C., HEIMANN, M., HEWITSON, B., HOSKINS, B. J., JOOS, F., JOUZEL, J., KATSOV, V., LOHMANN, U., MATSUNO, T., MOLINA, M., NICHOLLS, N., OVERPECK, J., RAGA, G., RAMASWAMY, V., REN, J., RUSTICUCCI, M., SOMERVILLE, R., STOCKER, T. F., WHETTON, P., WOOD, R. A. and WRATT, D. (2007). Technical summary. In *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H. L. Miller, eds.). Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York.
- SONG, W. M. (1996). On the estimation of optimal batch sizes in the analysis of simulation output. *European Journal of Operational Research* **88** 304–319.
- STANHILL, G. and COHEN, S. (2001). Global dimming: A review of the evidence for a widespread and significant reduction in global radiation with discussion of its probable causes and possible agricultural consequences. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **107** 255–278.
- TONG, H. (1990). *Non-Linear Time Series: A Dynamical System Approach*. Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford. [MR1079320](#)
- VOGELSANG, T. J. (1998). Trend function hypothesis testing in the presence of serial correlation. *Econometrica* **66** 123–148. [MR1616109](#)
- WIENER, N. (1958). *Nonlinear Problems in Random Theory*. MIT Press, Cambridge. [MR0100912](#)
- WU, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **102** 14150–14154. [MR2172215](#)
- WU, W. B. (2007a). M-estimation of linear models with dependent errors. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 495–521. [MR2336857](#)

- WU, W. B. (2007b). Strong invariance principles for dependent random variables. *Ann. Probab.* **35** 2294–2320. [MR2353389](#)
- WU, W. B. and SHAO, X. (2004). Limit theorems for iterated random functions. *J. Appl. Probab.* **41** 425–436. [MR2052582](#)
- WU, W. B., WOODROOFE, M. and MENTZ, G. (2001). Isotonic regression: Another look at the change point problem. *Biometrika* **88** 793–804. [MR1859410](#)
- WU, W. B. and ZHAO, Z. (2007). Inference of trends in time series. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **69** 391–410. [MR2323759](#)
- YU, K. and JONES, M. C. (1998). Local linear quantile regression. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **93** 228–237. [MR1614628](#)
- YU, K., LU, Z. and STANDER, J. (2003). Quantile regression: Applications and current research areas. *The Statistician* **52** 331–350. [MR2011179](#)

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
5734 S. UNIVERSITY AVENUE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637
USA
E-MAIL: zhou@galton.uchicago.edu
[wbwu@galton.uchicago.edu](mailto:wbu@galton.uchicago.edu)