

Matrix-valued Network Autoregression Model with Latent Group Structure

Yimeng Ren¹, Xuening Zhu^{1*} and Yanyuan Ma²

¹*Fudan University, Shanghai, China;*

²*The Pennsylvania State University, PA, USA*

Abstract

Matrix-valued time series data are frequently observed in a broad range of areas and have attracted great attention recently. In this work, we model network effects for high dimensional matrix-valued time series data in a matrix autoregression framework. To characterize the potential heterogeneity of the subjects and handle the high dimensionality simultaneously, we assume that each subject has a latent group label, which enables us to cluster the subject into the corresponding row and column groups. We propose a group matrix network autoregression (GMNAR) model, which assumes that the subjects in the same group share the same set of model parameters. To estimate the model, we develop an iterative algorithm. Theoretically, we show that the group-wise parameters and group memberships can be consistently estimated when the group numbers are correctly or possibly over-specified. An information criterion for group number estimation is also provided to consistently select the group numbers. Lastly, we implement the method on a Yelp dataset to illustrate the usefulness of the method.

KEY WORDS: Latent group; Matrix-valued time series; Network data; Vector autoregression.

*Xuening Zhu (xueningzhu@fudan.edu.cn) is the corresponding author.

1 Introduction

High dimensional matrix-valued time series data are widely collected and analyzed in a variety of scientific studies, including economics, finance, computer vision, and many others (Walden and Serroukh, 2002; Leng and Tang, 2012; Zhou, 2014; Wang et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2019; Chen and Fan, 2021; Chang et al., 2021). For instance, the dynamic import-export volumes among countries naturally constitute a matrix-valued time series data, where each matrix at one time point refers to a directed international trading network (Chen and Chen, 2019). The dynamic visiting and reviewing behaviors of users on specific items (e.g., movies, restaurants) also constitute matrix-valued time series, where each matrix represents the user scores on corresponding items (Mao et al., 2021). Another example is the time-varying 2-D gray-scale images, which also form a matrix-valued time series, with each image at one time point represented as a matrix (Chen and Fan, 2021). Considering the wide applications of matrix-valued data, it is important to study the dynamic patterns of the matrix-valued time series.

A straightforward way to analyze matrix data is to “flatten” it into vectors or to consider only individual row or column vectors of a matrix. However, this will destroy the intrinsic multidimensional structure and lacks a comprehensive interpretation as noted by several recent studies (Zhou and Li, 2014; Wang et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2019, 2021). To deal with matrix-valued time series data, two main approaches are taken in the literature. The first is using factor models for matrix data. This approach extends the one-dimensional factor to a two-dimensional matrix form, and it reveals the intrinsic low-rank structure of the high dimensional matrix data. For example, Chen and Chen (2019) used the matrix factor model proposed by Wang et al. (2019) to model the dynamics in trading policies and international trading trend patterns. Chen and Fan (2021) investigated the estimation and inference problem of the factor model using a PCA type method, which can recover the low rank structure and integrate the mean and covariance information. The second approach is using matrix autoregression model, which extends the vector autoregression model to the

matrix form. For instance, [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#) introduced a matrix autoregression model with a bilinear form and significantly reduced the number of parameters compared to using the vector model approaches. [Hsu et al. \(2021\)](#) proposed a structured autoregressive model for matrix-valued time series, which incorporates the spatial structure and reduces the dimension to control the estimation variability. [Chang et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Wang et al. \(2021a,b\)](#) employed the tensor decomposition technique to deal with matrix and tensor-valued time series data.

Despite of the achievements of these approaches, there are several issues still remaining to be solved. First, although the matrix autoregression model is able to reduce the parameters numbers compared to the vector model approach, it still needs to estimate $O(N^2)$ parameters for an $N \times N$ matrix-valued time series. Consequently, the model performance can be unstable especially when N is large but the time length is limited. Second, although the factor model is able to capture the low-rank structure of the matrix-valued time series, it fails to incorporate valuable observed dependence structure among the units, such as the network structure. Motivated by the above facts, we propose a matrix network autoregression model with a two-way group structure. First, suppose we can collect the network structure among the rows and columns of the matrix. Then we incorporate the valuable network information into the matrix autoregression model to reduce the model parameters. This extends the approach of network vector autoregression model by [Zhu et al. \(2017\)](#) to the matrix data case. Second, it is remarkable that the nodal heterogeneity widely exists in practice ([Ke et al., 2015](#)). For instance, the houses in Beijing with different building constructions may have varying price levels ([Huang et al., 2023](#)). To characterize the heterogeneity of the model parameters, we take the approach of the group panel data models ([Ke et al., 2015](#); [Su et al., 2016](#); [Ando and Bai, 2016](#); [Guðmundsson and Brownlees, 2021](#)) to assume a two-way group structure for the autoregression coefficients.

Recently, the group panel data model has received great attention. Its key assumption is that individuals from the same group share the same set of regression coefficients. For example, [Bonhomme and Manresa \(2015\)](#) and [Bester and Hansen \(2016\)](#) considered the

panel model with grouped time-varying effects and individual fixed effects, respectively. [Ando and Bai \(2016\)](#) proposed a linear panel data model with grouped factor structure. To estimate the coefficients with group structure, a Classifier Lasso (C-Lasso) estimation procedure was constructed to simultaneously identify the groups and estimate the parameters by [Su et al. \(2016\)](#), and further extended to more complex model forms ([Su and Ju, 2018](#); [Su et al., 2019](#)). The estimation and inference of group panel model with over-specified group number was investigated by [Liu et al. \(2020\)](#). [Zhu and Pan \(2020\)](#) also proposed a grouped network autoregression model, which incorporates the network structure into the group panel data setting. However, to our best knowledge, the current group panel data literature only considers vector-valued time series data, hence they cannot be directly used in modeling the matrix-valued time series data. In addition, the theoretical analysis is challenging since the row and column group structures may interact with each other.

The main contribution of our work can be summarized as follows. First, we propose a highly interpretable network autoregression model for the high dimensional matrix-valued time series data. Second, to circumvent the high dimensionality, we impose a two-way group structure on the model coefficients to capture the potential heterogeneity. Third, theoretically, we establish the estimation consistency for both model parameters and two-way group memberships when the numbers of groups are correctly or over-specified. Fourth, a group selection criterion is devised to consistently choose the true group numbers. The asymptotic normality is established when the group numbers are correctly specified for statistical inference.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we introduce the notations used throughout the paper, and propose the group matrix network autoregression model. [Section 3](#) provides the model estimation procedure, as well as the group number selection method. The theoretical properties of parameter estimation, group memberships estimation and the number of groups estimation are given in [Section 4](#). A number of simulation experiments are designed in [Section 5](#) to demonstrate the finite sample performance of our

proposed method, followed by an application on the Yelp dataset in Section 6. Some concluding remarks are given in Section 7. All technique details and proofs are provided in the supplementary materials.

2 Model and Notations

Let $\mathbf{Y}_t = (Y_{ijt}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \times N_2}$ be a matrix-valued time series collected from two sets of subjects, namely, N_1 row subjects and N_2 column subjects. For instance, Y_{ijt} can be the number of visits paid by the i th user to the j th location at the t th time, or it can be the sales amount of the i th merchandise sold in the j th store at the t th time.

For each set of subjects, we can collect a corresponding network structure. Specifically, to characterize the network structures of row and column subjects, we employ a row adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}_1 = (a_{1ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \times N_1}$ and a column adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}_2 = (a_{2ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2 \times N_2}$ respectively. For instance, \mathbf{A}_1 may characterize the social network relationship among the users, with $a_{1ij} = 1$ implying the i th user following the j th user, and $a_{1ij} = 0$ otherwise. Similarly, \mathbf{A}_2 may reflect the spatial adjacency relationships among the locations, where $a_{2ij} = 1$ indicates the i th location is a spatial neighbour to the j th location, and $a_{2ij} = 0$ otherwise. Following the convention we set $a_{1ii} = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq N_1$ and $a_{2jj} = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq N_2$. Further define $\mathbf{W}_1 = (a_{1ij}/n_{1i})$ and $\mathbf{W}_2 = (a_{2ij}/n_{2j})$ as the row and column-normalized adjacency matrices of \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 respectively, where $n_{1i} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} a_{1ij}$ and $n_{2j} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_2} a_{2ij}$.

We consider modeling the dynamics of \mathbf{Y}_t with group structures on both row and column subjects. Assume there are a total of G row groups and H column groups. For the i th row subject, we denote its membership as g_i ($1 \leq g_i \leq G$), and for the j th column subject, we denote its membership as h_j ($1 \leq h_j \leq H$). At the t th time, to model the response Y_{ijt} , we take into account the exogenous covariate vector associated with the i th row subject, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_{it} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}$, and the j th column subject, i.e., $\mathbf{z}_{jt} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$ respectively. Thus, given the group membership information g_i and h_j , we propose the following network autoregression model

with a two-way group structure

$$Y_{ijt} = \lambda_{g_i} \sum_{k=1}^{N_1} w_{1ik} Y_{kj(t-1)} + \gamma_{h_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} Y_{ik(t-1)} w_{2kj} + \alpha_{g_i h_j} Y_{ij(t-1)} + \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{g_i} + \mathbf{z}_{jt}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{h_j} + \varepsilon_{ijt}, \quad (2.1)$$

where ε_{ijt} is *i.i.d* white noise with $E(\varepsilon_{ijt}) = 0$ and $\text{var}(\varepsilon_{ijt}) = \sigma^2$. Namely, ε_{ijt} is independent of each other for different (i, j, t) and ε_{ijt} is independent of $\mathbf{Y}_{\cdot j(t-1)} = (Y_{ij(t-1)} : i \in [N_1])^\top$, $\mathbf{Y}_{i \cdot (t-1)} = (Y_{ij(t-1)} : j \in [N_2])$, \mathbf{x}_{it} , and \mathbf{z}_{jt} . Note that we allow the model parameters $\lambda_{g_i}, \gamma_{h_j}, \alpha_{g_i h_j}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{g_i}, \boldsymbol{\delta}_{h_j}$ to be group specific. Here, λ_{g_i} and γ_{h_j} quantify the row and column network effects, $\alpha_{g_i h_j}$ denotes the (i, j) observation's self-driven time effect, and $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{g_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}, \boldsymbol{\delta}_{h_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}$ are respectively the row and column covariate effects. For identification, we require that $\sum_g \zeta_{g,1} = 0$ when we include both intercepts in \mathbf{x}_{it} and \mathbf{z}_{it} , where $\zeta_{g_i,1}$ (the first element of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{g_i}$) is the intercept for \mathbf{x}_{it} .

We refer to the model (2.1) as a group matrix network autoregression (GMNAR) model. Given $g_1, \dots, g_{N_1}, h_1, \dots, h_{N_2}$, the GMNAR model can be expressed using a matrix form as

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{L} \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{Y}_{t-1} + \mathbf{Y}_{t-1} \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{G} + \mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{Y}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{X,t} \mathbf{1}_{N_2}^\top + \mathbf{1}_{N_1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{Z,t}^\top + \mathbf{E}_t, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathbf{L} = \text{diag}(\lambda_{g_i} : 1 \leq i \leq N_1) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \times N_1}$, $\mathbf{G} = \text{diag}(\gamma_{h_j} : 1 \leq j \leq N_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2 \times N_2}$, $\mathbf{A} = (\alpha_{g_i h_j} : 1 \leq i \leq N_1, 1 \leq j \leq N_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \times N_2}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{X,t} = (\mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{g_i} : 1 \leq i \leq N_1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{Z,t} = (\mathbf{z}_{jt}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{h_j} : 1 \leq j \leq N_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2}$, and $\mathbf{E}_t = (\varepsilon_{ijt}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \times N_2}$. Here we use $\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{B}$ to denote the hadamard product between matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} .

The GMNAR model strikes a balance of model flexibility and simplicity. On one hand, by clustering the parameters in row and column groups, we are able to share common information and to reduce the model complexity. On the other hand, we allow the row and column network effects (λ_{g_i} and γ_{h_j}) to depend on their group memberships to keep the model parsimonious while flexible in practice. In addition, we allow the time dependence of an observation with its own past (relation between Y_{ijt} and $Y_{ij(t-1)}$) to be row and column group specific. In an extreme case when $G = H = 1$, we end up with a simple matrix

autoregression model with homogenous model parameters. As another extreme case, when $G = N_1$ and $H = N_2$, then the GMNAR model reduces to an individual specific model reflecting great heterogeneity among the subjects.

Throughout the paper, we use the following notations. Denote $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for an integer n . For a matrix $\mathbf{M} = (m_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$, let \mathbf{M}_i be the i th row vector and \mathbf{M}_j as the j th column vector of \mathbf{M} . In addition, let $\mathbf{M}^{(\mathcal{C}, \cdot)} = (m_{ij} : i \in \mathcal{C}, j \in [n_2])$ and $\mathbf{M}^{(\cdot, \mathcal{C})} = (m_{ij} : i \in [n_1], j \in \mathcal{C})$, where \mathcal{C} is an index set. Denote $\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ as the Hadamard product between matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$. For a symmetric matrix \mathbf{M} , define $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M})$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M})$ as the corresponding smallest and largest eigenvalues. For a vector, matrix, or tensor \mathbf{M} , let $\|\mathbf{M}\|_{\max}$ denote its largest absolute entry. For a vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_j : j \in [p])^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$, let $\|\mathbf{v}\| = (\sum_{j=1}^p v_j^2)^{1/2}$. For a set \mathcal{S} , denote $|\mathcal{S}|$ as the cardinal number of \mathcal{S} . Define $a_N \gg b_N$ as $a_N/b_N \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, denote $\mathbf{1}_p$ as a p -dimensional vector with all elements equal to one. Denote \mathbf{I}_p as an identity matrix with dimension $p \times p$.

3 Model Estimation

In this section, we discuss the estimation of the GMNAR model (2.2). Let $\mathcal{G} = (g_i : 1 \leq i \leq N_1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$ and $\mathcal{H} = (g_j : 1 \leq j \leq N_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2}$ be the row and column membership vectors. In addition, for $g \in [G], h \in [H]$, let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_g^r = (\lambda_g, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_g^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1+1}$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c = (\gamma_h, \boldsymbol{\delta}_h^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2+1}$. Besides, let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_{gh})_{g \in [G], h \in [H]} \in \mathbb{R}^{G \times H}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}^r, \boldsymbol{\theta}^c, \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1+p_2+GH+2}$. We also write $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\boldsymbol{\zeta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_G) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times G}$, $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\boldsymbol{\delta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\delta}_H) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2 \times H}$. To estimate the model parameters and the group memberships, we consider minimizing the following least squares objective function,

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(Y_{ijt} - \lambda_{g_i} \sum_{k=1}^{N_1} w_{1ik} Y_{kj(t-1)} - \gamma_{h_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} Y_{ik(t-1)} w_{2kj} - \alpha_{g_i h_j} Y_{ij(t-1)} - \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{g_i} - \mathbf{z}_{jt}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{h_j} \right)^2. \quad (3.1)$$

We first discuss the estimation when the group memberships (\mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H}) are given. Let $\mathcal{R}_g = \{i : g_i = g\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_h = \{j : h_j = h\}$. To minimize the objective function, we should have

$$\frac{\partial Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_g^r} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \frac{\partial Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \frac{\partial Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})}{\partial \alpha_{gh}} = 0$$

for all $g \in [G], h \in [H]$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_t &= (\mathbf{x}_{1t}, \mathbf{x}_{2t}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{N_1t})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1 \times p_1}, \\ \mathbf{Z}_t &= (\mathbf{z}_{1t}, \mathbf{z}_{2t}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{N_2t})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2 \times p_2}, \\ \mathbb{X}_{ght} &= \left(\text{vec}(\mathbf{W}_1^{(\mathcal{R}_g, \cdot)} \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^{(\cdot, \mathcal{C}_h)}), \mathbf{1}_{N_{2h}} \otimes \mathbf{X}_t^{(\mathcal{R}_g, \cdot)} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_{1g}N_{2h}) \times (p_1+1)}, \\ \mathbb{Z}_{ght} &= \left(\text{vec}(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^{(\mathcal{R}_g, \cdot)} \mathbf{W}_2^{(\cdot, \mathcal{C}_h)}), \mathbf{Z}_t^{(\mathcal{C}_h, \cdot)} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N_{1g}} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_{1g}N_{2h}) \times (p_2+1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where $N_{1g} = |\mathcal{R}_g|$ and $N_{2h} = |\mathcal{C}_h|$. Then one can verify that

$$\frac{\partial Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_g^r} = \left(\sum_{t,h} \mathbb{X}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{X}_{ght} \right) \boldsymbol{\theta}_g^r - \sum_{t,h} \mathbb{X}_{ght}^\top \left(\mathbb{Y}_{ght} - \mathbb{Y}_{gh(t-1)} \alpha_{gh} - \mathbb{Z}_{ght} \boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c \right), \quad (3.3)$$

$$\frac{\partial Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c} = \left(\sum_{t,g} \mathbb{Z}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{Z}_{ght} \right) \boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c - \sum_{t,g} \mathbb{Z}_{ght}^\top \left(\mathbb{Y}_{ght} - \mathbb{Y}_{gh(t-1)} \alpha_{gh} - \mathbb{X}_{ght} \boldsymbol{\theta}_g^r \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathbb{Y}_{ght} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{Y}_t^{(\mathcal{R}_g, \mathcal{C}_h)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}_g| |\mathcal{C}_h|}$. Furthermore, it holds that,

$$\frac{\partial Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})}{\partial \alpha_{gh}} = \sum_t \|\mathbb{Y}_{gh(t-1)}\|^2 \alpha_{gh} - \sum_t \mathbb{Y}_{gh(t-1)}^\top \left(\mathbb{Y}_{ght} - \mathbb{X}_{ght} \boldsymbol{\theta}_g^r - \mathbb{Z}_{ght} \boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c \right). \quad (3.5)$$

By (3.3)–(3.5), we can derive that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \mathbf{M}^{-1} \mathbf{b}$, where

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}^r & \mathbf{M}^{rc} & \mathbf{M}^{r\alpha} \\ \mathbf{M}^{rc\top} & \mathbf{M}^c & \mathbf{M}^{c\alpha} \\ \mathbf{M}^{r\alpha\top} & \mathbf{M}^{c\alpha\top} & \mathbf{M}^\alpha \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}^r \\ \mathbf{b}^c \\ \mathbf{b}^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.6)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{M}_g^r &= \sum_{t,h} \mathbb{X}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{X}_{ght}, \quad \mathbf{M}^r = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{M}_g^r : g \in [G]\} \in \mathbb{R}^{G(p_1+1) \times G(p_1+1)}, \\
\mathbf{M}_{gh}^{rc} &= \sum_t \mathbb{X}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{Z}_{ght}, \quad \mathbf{M}^{rc} = (\mathbf{M}_{gh}^{rc} : g \in [G], h \in [H]) \in \mathbb{R}^{G(p_1+1) \times H(p_2+1)}, \\
\mathbf{M}_{g\mathcal{I}_{g'h}}^{r\alpha} &= \sum_t \mathbb{X}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{Y}_{gh(t-1)} I(g = g') \text{ with } \mathcal{I}_{g'h} = (h-1)G + g', \\
\mathbf{M}^{r\alpha} &= (\mathbf{M}_{g\mathcal{I}_{g'h}}^{r\alpha} : g \in [G], \mathcal{I}_{g'h} \in [GH]) \in \mathbb{R}^{G(p_1+1) \times GH}, \\
\mathbf{M}_h^c &= \sum_{t,g} \mathbb{Z}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{Z}_{ght}, \quad \mathbf{M}^c = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{M}_h^c : h \in [H]\} \in \mathbb{R}^{H(p_2+1) \times H(p_2+1)}, \\
\mathbf{M}_{h\mathcal{I}_{gh'}}^{c\alpha} &= \sum_t \mathbb{Z}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{Y}_{gh(t-1)} I(h = h'), \quad \mathbf{M}^{c\alpha} = (\mathbf{M}_{h\mathcal{I}_{gh'}}^{c\alpha} : h \in [H], \mathcal{I}_{gh'} \in [GH]) \in \mathbb{R}^{H(p_2+1) \times GH}, \\
\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{I}_{gh}\mathcal{I}_{g'h'}}^\alpha &= \sum_t \|\mathbb{Y}_{gh(t-1)}\|^2 I(g = g', h = h'), \\
\mathbf{M}^\alpha &= (\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{I}_{gh}\mathcal{I}_{g'h'}}^\alpha : \mathcal{I}_{gh} \in [GH], \mathcal{I}_{g'h'} \in [GH]) \in \mathbb{R}^{GH \times GH}, \\
\mathbf{b}_g^r &= \sum_{t,h} \mathbb{X}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{Y}_{ght}, \quad \mathbf{b}^r = (\mathbf{b}_g^{r\top} : g \in [G])^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{G(p_1+1)}, \\
\mathbf{b}_h^c &= \sum_{t,g} \mathbb{Z}_{ght}^\top \mathbb{Y}_{ght}, \quad \mathbf{b}^c = (\mathbf{b}_h^{c\top} : h \in [H])^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{H(p_2+1)}, \\
\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{I}_{gh}}^\alpha &= \sum_t \mathbb{Y}_{gh(t-1)}^\top \mathbb{Y}_{ght}, \quad \mathbf{b}^\alpha = (\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{I}_{gh}}^\alpha : \mathcal{I}_{gh} \in [GH])^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{GH}.
\end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, given the parameters, we consider to estimate the group memberships. To this end, we estimate \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} in an iterative way. First, given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and \mathcal{H} , the \mathcal{G} is updated by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{g}_i = \arg \min_{g_i \in [G]} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ Y_{ijt} - \lambda_{g_i} \sum_{k=1}^{N_1} w_{1ik} Y_{kj(t-1)} - \gamma_{h_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} Y_{ik(t-1)} w_{2kj} \right. \\
\left. - \alpha_{g_i h_j} Y_{ij(t-1)} - \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{g_i} - \mathbf{z}_{jt}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{h_j} \right\}^2 \quad (3.7)
\end{aligned}$$

for $i \in [N_1]$. One can observe that the updating of (3.7) is only related to the row subject i and not dependent on other row subjects. Hence it can be conducted in a computationally

efficient way. Similarly, given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and \mathcal{G} , we update \mathcal{H} by

$$\hat{h}_j = \arg \min_{h_j \in [H]} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\{ Y_{ijt} - \lambda_{g_i} \sum_{k=1}^{N_1} w_{1ik} Y_{kj(t-1)} - \gamma_{h_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} Y_{ik(t-1)} w_{2kj} - \alpha_{g_i h_j} Y_{ij(t-1)} - \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{g_i} - \mathbf{z}_{jt}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{h_j} \right\}^2. \quad (3.8)$$

for $j \in [N_2]$. We summarize the algorithm in Algorithm 1. The algorithm consists of iterations of two major steps. The first step is estimating the parameters given group memberships, and the second step is updating group memberships given the parameters. Each step can be calculated in a fast manner due to the simple analytical forms. In addition, we discuss how to obtain the initial estimators in Appendix 2. Particularly, we remark that the algorithm requires the group numbers G, H to be specified first. Therefore, we give a criterion to estimate the true group numbers G_0 and H_0 , and establish the selection consistency thereafter.

3.1 Selection of Group Numbers

Subsequently, we discuss the estimation of group numbers G and H . To slightly abuse the notations, we write $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(G,H)}, \hat{\mathcal{G}}^{(G,H)}, \hat{\mathcal{H}}^{(G,H)}$ as the estimators when the row and column groups numbers are specified as G and H respectively. Then we estimate G_0 and H_0 by using the following information criterion,

$$\text{QIC}(G, H) = \log\{Q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(G,H)}, \hat{\mathcal{G}}^{(G,H)}, \hat{\mathcal{H}}^{(G,H)})\} + \lambda(G, H), \quad (3.9)$$

where $\lambda(G, H)$ is a penalty function. Then we estimate the group numbers by $(\hat{G}, \hat{H}) = \arg \min_{(G,H)} \text{QIC}(G, H)$. In the theoretical analysis, we show that as long as the penalty function satisfies $T^{-1/2}m \ll \lambda(G, H)/(G + H) \ll c_{\text{gap}}c_\pi^2/(GH)$, we can estimate G_0 and H_0 consistently with the QIC criterion. Here c_{gap}, c_π are group related values related to model signals, which will be introduced later in our theoretical analysis. In our numerical study,

we set $\eta = \{40(\log T)T^{1/8}\}^{-1}$, which works well in our numerical experiments.

Algorithm 1 Estimation of the GMNAR Model

- 1: **Input:** $\{\mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{X}_t, \mathbf{Z}_t\}$, $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$, and $\{G, H\}$.
 - 2: Obtain initial group memberships $\mathcal{G}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ according to Appendix 2. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}, \mathcal{G}^{(k)}, \mathcal{H}^{(k)}\}$ be the estimators and memberships in the k th iteration.
 - 3: Repeat STEP 1 and STEP 2 for $k = 1, \dots$ until convergence.
 - STEP 1. Given $\{\mathcal{G}^{(k-1)}, \mathcal{H}^{(k-1)}\}$, calculate $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)} = (\mathbf{M}^{(k-1)})^{-1}\mathbf{b}^{(k-1)}$, where $\mathbf{M}^{(k-1)}$ and $\mathbf{b}^{(k-1)}$ are obtained from (3.6) with $\{\mathcal{G}^{(k-1)}, \mathcal{H}^{(k-1)}\}$ specified.
 - STEP 2. Given $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(k)}$, update the memberships by (3.7) and (3.8) to obtain $\{\mathcal{G}^{(k)}, \mathcal{H}^{(k)}\}$.
 - 4: **Output:** Final estimator and memberships: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(K)}$, $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{G}^{(K)}$, $\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}^{(K)}$. Here K is the final number of iteration rounds.
-

4 Theoretical Properties

4.1 Estimation Consistency

Define $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{ij} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{g_i}^{r\top}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_j}^{c\top}, \alpha_{g_i h_j})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1+p_2+3}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = (\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{ij} : i \in [N_1], j \in [N_2])$ as a tensor of dimension $N_1 \times N_2 \times (p_1 + p_2 + 3)$. With $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ we can rewrite (3.1) as

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\Theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \sum_{t=1}^T (Y_{ijt} - \mathcal{X}_{ijt}^\top \boldsymbol{\Theta}_{ij})^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} Q_{ij}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{ij}). \quad (4.1)$$

For any $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_{ij} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\hat{g}_i}^{r\top}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\hat{h}_j}^{c\top}, \hat{\alpha}_{\hat{g}_i \hat{h}_j})^\top)$, we define the following pseudo distance as

$$\begin{aligned} d(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}) &= \frac{1}{N_1 N_2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{\Theta}_{ij} \right\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\hat{g}_i}^r - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{g_i}^r \right\|^2 + \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\hat{h}_j}^c - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_j}^c \right\|^2 + \frac{1}{N_1 N_2} \sum_{i,j} |\hat{\alpha}_{\hat{g}_i \hat{h}_j} - \alpha_{g_i h_j}|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Therefore the $d(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})$ measures the average distance between $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$. In the following we first establish the consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ using this pseudo metric. To this end, we require the following conditions.

Assumption 1. (PARAMETER SPACE) $\|\Theta\|_{\max} < R$, where R is a positive constant.

Assumption 2. (CONVEXITY) Let $\mathcal{X}_{ijt} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\sum_{k=1}^{N_1} w_{1ik} Y_{kj(t-1)}, \mathbf{x}_{it}^\top, \sum_{k=1}^{N_2} Y_{ik(t-1)} w_{2kj}, \mathbf{z}_{jt}^\top, Y_{ij(t-1)})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1+p_2+3}$ and let $\Sigma_{ij} = E(\mathcal{X}_{ijt} \mathcal{X}_{ijt}^\top)$ and $\tau_{\min} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{i,j} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{ij})$ is a positive constant.

Assumption 3. (DISTRIBUTION OF NOISE TERM) Assume ε_{ijt} is i.i.d across $i \in [N_1]$, $j \in [N_2]$, and $t \in [T]$. In addition, ε_{ijt} is a zero-mean sub-Gaussian variable with a scale factor $0 < \sigma < \infty$, i.e., $E\{\exp(u\varepsilon_{ijt})\} \leq \exp(\sigma^2 u^2/2)$. Let ε_{ijt} be independent of $\{\mathbf{Y}_s : s \leq t-1\}$, $\{\mathbf{X}_s = (\mathbf{x}_{is} : i \in [N_1])^\top : s \leq t\}$, and $\{\mathbf{Z}_s = (\mathbf{z}_{js} : j \in [N_2])^\top : s \leq t\}$.

Assumption 4. (DISTRIBUTION OF COVARIATES) Assume $E(\mathbf{x}_{it}) = \mathbf{0}$ and $E(\mathbf{z}_{jt}) = \mathbf{0}$ for any $i \in [N_1]$, $j \in [N_2]$ and $t \in [T]$. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{1i} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1}\}$ (and $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{2j} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_2}\}$) be a sequence of constant vectors that satisfying $\max_{i \in [N_1]} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{1i}\| \leq c$ (and $\max_{j \in [N_2]} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{2j}\| \leq c$) for a constant c . Define $\mathbf{x}_t^\eta = (\mathbf{x}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1i} : i \in [N_1])^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$, $\mathbf{z}_t^\eta = (\mathbf{z}_{jt}^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2j} : j \in [N_2])^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2}$. Assume $\{(\mathbf{x}_t^\eta, \mathbf{z}_t^\eta)^\top : 0 \leq t \leq T\}^\top$ satisfies the K -convex concentration property for some constant K according to Definition 1 in the Appendix.

Assumption 5. (STATIONARITY) Assume that $\max_{g \in [G_0], h \in [H_0]} |\lambda_g^0 + \gamma_h^0 + \alpha_{gh}^0| \leq \kappa_{\max} < 1$, where G_0 and H_0 are true number of groups and κ_{\max} is a positive constant.

Assumption 6. (GROUP DIFFERENCE) $\min_{g_1 \neq g_2} \{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{g_1}^0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{g_2}^0\|^2 + \max_{h \in [H_0]} |\alpha_{g_1 h}^0 - \alpha_{g_2 h}^0|^2\} \geq c_{\text{gap}}$ and $\min_{h_1 \neq h_2} \{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_1}^{c_0} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_2}^{c_0}\|^2 + \max_{g \in [G_0]} |\alpha_{g h_1}^0 - \alpha_{g h_2}^0|^2\} \geq c_{\text{gap}}$, where $c_{\text{gap}} > 0$ and is allowed to go to zero.

Assumption 7. (GROUP PROPORTION) Let $\pi_g^r = \lim_{N_1 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i I(g_i^0 = g)/N_1$ and $\pi_h^c = \lim_{N_2 \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j I(h_j^0 = h)/N_2$ for $g \in [G_0]$ and $h \in [H_0]$. Assume $\min_{g \in [G_0], h \in [H_0]} \min\{\pi_g^r, \pi_h^c\} \geq c_\pi > 0$ and c_π is allowed to go to zero.

The Assumption 1 requires the parameter space to be compact. Assumption 2 ensures the convexity of the pairwise objective function, i.e., $Q_{ij}(\Theta_{ij})$, as a function of Θ_{ij} for sufficiently large T . This condition is crucial for establishing the consistency result for the pseudo distance in (4.2).

Subsequently, Assumptions 3–4 concern about the distribution of the noise term and covariates respectively. Specifically, Assumption 3 requires the noise term ε_{ijt} follows sub-Gaussian distribution. It is widely used in high dimensional literature (Wang et al., 2013; Lugosi and Mendelson, 2019; Fan et al., 2021). Subsequently, Assumption 4 allows the covariates $\{\mathbf{x}_{it}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{z}_{jt}\}$ to be correlated but satisfying the K -convex concentration property according to Definition 1. This assumption is employed to establish Hanson-Wright type inequality for dependent variables (Adamczak, 2015). As discussed by Adamczak (2015), a variety of random variables satisfy the K -convex concentration property. In particular, the concentration for random vectors is obtained by Samson (2000) for bounded coordinates with certain uniform mixing conditions. We further comment that the Assumptions 3–4 together imply that $\mathbf{v}^\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=}} (\mathbf{v}_t^\eta : 0 \leq t \leq T)^\top$ satisfies the K -convex concentration property for some constant K . Here $\mathbf{v}_t^\eta = (\mathbf{x}_t^{\eta^\top}, \mathbf{z}_t^{\eta^\top}, \mathbb{E}_t^\top)^\top$, where $\mathbb{E}_t = \text{vec}(\mathbf{E}_t)$.

Next, Assumption 5 ensures the stationarity of the matrix-valued time series data. Assumptions 6 and 7 are imposed on certain group properties. Condition 6 assumes there is a gap between true parameters of two different groups. The condition is an extension of the same type condition assumed by the group panel data models with only one group specified (Su et al., 2016; Ando and Bai, 2016; Zhang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2020). The special care is paid for the autoregression parameter α_{gh} , where the row and column groups are both involved. Therefore we require a min-max type condition for α_{gh}^0 in Assumption 6. Furthermore, instead of assuming $c_{\text{gap}} > c > 0$ by a positive constant c in existing literature (Zhang et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2020), we allow $c_{\text{gap}} \rightarrow 0$ to study how this signal strength affects the theoretical properties. Lastly, Assumption 7 assumes that there is a lower bound of row and column group proportions. Here we allow $c_\pi \rightarrow 0$, which indicates that we may have diverging group numbers with $G_0, H_0 \rightarrow \infty$. This is also a relaxed condition than existing literature where a fixed number of groups is typically assumed (Su et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2020). In the following we establish the consistency result for the pseudo distance.

Theorem 1. *Suppose $G \geq G_0$ and $H \geq H_0$, where G_0 and H_0 are true number of groups.*

In addition, assume Assumptions 1–5 hold. Then it follows,

$$d(\widehat{\Theta}, \Theta^0) = O_p(T^{-1/2}(m + \log(N_1 N_2))),$$

where $\Theta^0 = (\Theta_{ij}^0 = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{g_i^0}^{r0\top}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_j^0}^{c0\top}, \alpha_{g_i^0 h_j^0}^0)^\top)$ and $m = p_1 + p_2 + 3$.

Theorem 1 implies that as long as we have $T^{1/2} \gg \log(N_1 N_2) + m$, $\widehat{\Theta}$ is a consistent estimator for Θ^0 in the metric of pseudo distance when we allow for sufficiently many row and column groups. It is remarkable that the consistency result holds when the group numbers G and H are possibly over-specified. Furthermore, we discuss in Theorem 2 that the QIC can consistently select the true group numbers as long as the tuning parameters are properly specified.

Theorem 2. *Assume Conditions 1–7 hold. In addition, assume $\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda(G, H)/(G + H)$ satisfies*

$$T^{-1/2}(m + \log(N_1 N_2 H)) \ll \eta \ll c_{\text{gap}} c_\pi^2 / (GH). \quad (4.3)$$

Then we have $P(\widehat{G} = G_0, \widehat{H} = H_0) \rightarrow 1$ as $\min(N_1, N_2, T) \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2 implies that if we set η to satisfy (4.3), then we can estimate the true group numbers consistently. Particularly, we need $\eta \gg T^{-1/2}(m + \log(N_1 N_2 H))$ to ensure that $\text{QIC}(G, H) > \text{QIC}(G_0, H_0)$ when $G < G_0$ or $H < H_0$. On the other hand, we need $\eta \ll c_{\text{gap}} c_\pi^2 / (GH)$ to guarantee that $\text{QIC}(G, H) > \text{QIC}(G_0, H_0)$ when $G > G_0$ and $H > H_0$. When both conditions are satisfied, we are able to obtain $\widehat{G} = G_0$ and $\widehat{H} = H_0$ with probability tending to one with large samples. Next, in Section 4.2 we further discuss the node-wise parameter estimation result and the group membership estimation consistency.

4.2 Group Membership Estimation Consistency

As we stated before, the pseudo distance in (4.2) measures the average distance between $\widehat{\Theta}$ and Θ^0 . Therefore, the result in Theorem 1 is not sufficient to imply the parameter con-

sistency for each node. To this end, we derive the following node-wise parameter consistency result, which will be crucial to build the membership estimation consistency later.

Proposition 1. *Assume Assumptions 1–5 hold. When $G \geq G_0$ and $H \geq H_0$, we have*

$$\sup_j \left\{ \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\widehat{h}_j}^c - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_j^0}^{c0}\|^2 + \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i |\widehat{\alpha}_{\widehat{g}_i \widehat{h}_j} - \alpha_{g_i^0 h_j^0}^0|^2 \right\} = O_p(c_\pi^{-1} T^{-1/2} (m + \log(N_1 N_2))), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\sup_i \left\{ \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\widehat{g}_i}^r - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{g_i^0}^{r0}\|^2 + \frac{1}{N_2} \sum_j |\widehat{\alpha}_{\widehat{g}_i \widehat{h}_j} - \alpha_{g_i^0 h_j^0}^0|^2 \right\} = O_p(c_\pi^{-1} T^{-1/2} (m + \log(N_1 N_2))). \quad (4.5)$$

Note that (4.4)–(4.5) establish a uniform node-wise parameter estimation consistency, which is critical for establishing the group membership consistency for $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ when $G \geq G_0$ and $H \geq H_0$. Since the discussions are similar for $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$, we take $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ for illustration in the following. Given $H_0, G_0, \mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{G}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and $H, G, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}, \boldsymbol{\theta}$, we first introduce the Hausdorff distance as

$$d_H(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^0; \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}^0) = \max \left\{ \max_{h_0 \in [H_0]} \min_{h \in [H]} \left(\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_0}^{c0}\|^2 + \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i |\alpha_{g_i h} - \alpha_{g_i^0 h_0}^0|^2 \right), \right. \\ \left. \max_{h \in [H]} \min_{h_0 \in [H_0]} \left(\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_0}^{c0}\|^2 + \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i |\alpha_{g_i h} - \alpha_{g_i^0 h_0}^0|^2 \right) \right\}.$$

Define a η -neighbourhood for $\boldsymbol{\theta}^0$ based on the Hausdorff distance as $\mathcal{N}_\eta = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : d_H(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^0; \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}^0) < \eta\}$. For $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{N}_\eta$, denote the sets

$$\mathcal{A}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}, h_0) = \left\{ h \in [H] : \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_h^c - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{h_0}^{c0}\|^2 + \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i |\alpha_{\widehat{g}_i h} - \alpha_{g_i^0 h_0}^0|^2 \leq \eta \right\},$$

for $h_0 \in [H_0]$. Here $\mathcal{A}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \cdot)$ is used to map the memberships in $[H_0]$ to $[H]$. We then establish the membership estimation consistency result as follows.

Theorem 3. *Assume Assumptions 1–7, $G \geq G_0$, and $H \geq H_0$. Suppose we have $d(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^0) = O_p(T^{-1/2} (m + \log(N_1 N_2)))$ and $c_{\text{gap}} c_\pi \gg d(\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \boldsymbol{\Theta}^0)$. Then the following conclusions hold:*

- (i) For all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{N}_\eta$ with $\eta < c_\pi c_{\text{gap}}/4$, $\{\mathcal{A}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}, h_0), h_0 \in [H_0]\}$ is a partition of $[H]$;
- (ii) Define the event $\Omega = \{\widehat{h}_j \in \mathcal{A}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}, h_j^0), \forall j \in [N_2]\}$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{N}_\eta$ and $\eta < \tau_{\min} c_{\text{gap}} c_\pi / \{4(\tau_{\min} +$

$\tau_{\max})\}$, where \hat{h}_j is defined by (3.8). Then we have

$$P(\Omega^c) \leq HN_1N_2 \exp\left(-c_1T^{1/2}c_{\text{gap}}c_\pi + c_2m\right),$$

where c_1, c_2 are two positive constants.

(iii) Define $\{\hat{h}_j : j \in [N_2]\}$ by (3.8) when $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is specified. Let $T^{1/2}c_{\text{gap}}c_\pi^2 \gg \log(N_1N_2H) + m$, then we have $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathcal{N}_\eta$ and for each $\tilde{h} \in [H]$, there exists a $h \in [H_0]$, such that $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tilde{h}} \subset \mathcal{C}_h^0$ with probability tending to 1.

We next comment about the results in Theorem 3. For any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{N}_\eta$, $\mathcal{A}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \cdot)$ defines a map from $[H_0]$ to $[H]$. The conclusion (i) implies that for any $h_1 \neq h_2$, we have $\mathcal{A}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}, h_1) \cap \mathcal{A}_\eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}, h_2) = \emptyset$ as long as η is sufficiently small. Next, the conclusion (ii) states that with a high probability, the event Ω will hold. Specifically, for $T^{1/2}c_{\text{gap}}c_\pi \gg \log(N_1N_2H) + m$, we have $P(\Omega^c) \rightarrow 0$. Subsequently, in conclusion (iii), we require a stronger condition to ensure that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathcal{N}_\eta$. As implied by the conclusion (iii), the true groups are splitted into subgroups instead of joining into new groups when $H \geq H_0$. With similar argument we can show that for each $\tilde{g} \in [G]$, there exists a $g \in [G_0]$, such that $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{\tilde{g}} \subset \mathcal{R}_g^0$ with probability tending to 1 when $G \geq G_0$.

Particularly, for $G = G_0$ and $H = H_0$, we can show that $\hat{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R}^0$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C}^0$ hold with probability tending to 1. Furthermore, let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{or}}$ be the oracle estimator when the true group memberships \mathcal{R}^0 and \mathcal{C}^0 are known. Then the oracle property holds that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{or}}$ with probability tending to 1. The result is presented in the following Corollary.

Corollary 1. Assume Assumptions 1–7, and $G = G_0$ $H = H_0$. Assume $T^{1/2}c_{\text{gap}}c_\pi^2 \gg \log(N_1N_2H) + m$. Then we have

$$\lim_{\min(N_1, N_2, T) \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\hat{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R}^0, \hat{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C}^0\right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (4.6)$$

$$\lim_{\min(N_1, N_2, T) \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{or}}\right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (4.7)$$

under label permutation.

The results in Corollary 1 imply that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is asymptotically equivalent to $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\text{or}}$. Therefore, to derive the asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, it is sufficient to investigate The details are given in the subsequent section.

4.3 Asymptotic Normality

Next, we discuss the statistical inference of the estimator. To facilitate the discussion, we assume the following condition.

Assumption 8. *Assume there exists n so that*

$$c_1 n \leq \min_{g,h} \{\min(N_{1g}, N_{2h})\} \leq \max_{g,h} \{\max(N_{1g}, N_{2h})\} \leq c_2 n,$$

where $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are constants, and $n \rightarrow \infty$ when $N_1, N_2 \rightarrow \infty$.

In other words, we assume all N_{1g} ($g \in [G]$) and N_{2h} ($h \in [H]$) to diverge at the same rate n , hence a balance between group sizes is obtained. Then we establish the asymptotic normality of the estimator in the following Theorem, which facilitates further statistical inference.

Theorem 4. *Assume Assumptions 1–8, and $G = G_0$ $H = H_0$. Assume $T^{1/2} c_{\text{gap}} c_{\pi}^2 \gg \log(N_1 N_2 H) + m$. Define $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \text{diag}\{(nN_2T)^{-1/2} \mathbf{I}_{G(1+p_1)}, (nN_1T)^{-1/2} \mathbf{I}_{H(1+p_2)}, n^{-1} T^{-1/2} \mathbf{I}_{GH}\}$, and $\mathbf{M}_{\Lambda}^0 = \boldsymbol{\Lambda} E(\mathbf{M}) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}$. Assume $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M}_{\Lambda}^0) \geq \tau > 0$ and $q^{3/2}/\sqrt{T} \rightarrow 0$, where $q = G(1+p_1) + H(1+p_2) + GH$. Then for any $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\| = 1$ we have*

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{-1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^0) \rightarrow_d N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\top} (\mathbf{M}_{\Lambda}^0)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\eta}). \quad (4.8)$$

Theorem 4 establishes the asymptotic normality of the estimator. Specifically, the convergence rates of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^r$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^c$ are $\sqrt{nN_2T}$ and $\sqrt{nN_1T}$ respectively. They are both faster than $\widehat{\alpha}_{gh}$,

which is $n\sqrt{T}$ -consistent according to (4.8). The difference is due to their different effective sample sizes. Using (4.8), we are able to conduct the statistical inference. In the following we conduct a number of numerical studies to evaluate the finite sample performances of the proposed method.

5 Simulation Study

5.1 Model Settings

To demonstrate the finite sample performance of our proposed method, we present several simulation studies in this section. Following the literature (Huang et al., 2017; Ren et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2022), we consider two different network structures.

Example 1. (Stochastic Block Model, SBM) The first type of network is the stochastic block model (Wang and Wong, 1987; Nowicki and Snijders, 2001), in which nodes in the same block (group) are assigned with higher probability to be connected, while nodes in different blocks are less likely to be connected. Following the setting of Nowicki and Snijders (2001), we first assign a group label randomly with the probability $1/K$ for each node, where K is the total number of groups. When the i th and the j th node are in the same group, we set $P(a_{ij} = 1) = 20/N$, and otherwise we set $P(a_{ij} = 1) = 2/N$.

Example 2. (Power-Law Distribution Network) The second type of network is generated from a power-law distribution following Clauset et al. (2009). For the i th node, its in-degree $d_i = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ji}$ is assumed to be power-law distributed. This coincides with the “super-star” effect in real world social networks, which refers to the phenomenon that only few people have a huge number of followers. Specifically, we first generate \tilde{d}_i from a discrete power-law distribution with probability $P(\tilde{d}_i = k) \propto k^{-2.5}$, and then we set $d_i = 4\tilde{d}_i$. Then, d_i followers of the i th node are randomly selected to construct the adjacency matrix.

In both examples, we consider three different scenarios for G_0 and H_0 . In each scenario,

the node memberships are sampled from the multinomial distribution with probability $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1 = \{\pi_g = G_0^{-1} : g = 1, \dots, G_0\}$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2 = \{\pi_h = H_0^{-1} : h = 1, \dots, H_0\}$. The dimension of exogenous covariates are set as $p_1 = p_2 = 3$, and the corresponding true parameters are shown in Table 1. For all scenarios, the covariates \mathbf{x}_{it} and \mathbf{z}_{jt} are generated from multivariate normal distribution $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{p_1})$ and $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{p_2})$, respectively. Lastly, we generate the noise term ε_{ijt} from $N(0, 1)$ independently.

5.2 Performance Measure and Simulation Results

In this section, we first introduce the model performance measure and then present the simulation results. We set the network sizes $(N_1, N_2) \in \{(100, 80), (200, 150), (300, 250)\}$. In addition, the time length is set to be $T \in \{20, 40\}$. For each scenario, we repeat the experiments for $R = 500$ times. Denote the estimated parameters in the r th replicate as $\widehat{\lambda}_g^{(r)}, \widehat{\gamma}_h^{(r)}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_g^{(r)}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_h^{(r)}, \widehat{\alpha}_{gh}^{(r)}$ and the corresponding estimated group number as $\widehat{G}^{(r)}$ and $\widehat{H}^{(r)}$.

5.2.1 Estimation when $G = G_0, H = H_0$

We first evaluate the estimation accuracy when the group numbers are correctly specified. Take $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_G)^\top$ for example. Denote $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(r)}$ as the estimator of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = (\lambda_1^0, \dots, \lambda_G^0)^\top$ in the r th replicate. To evaluate the estimation accuracy, we calculate the root mean squared error (RMSE) as $\text{RMSE}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \{R^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^R (\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{(r)} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0\|^2)\}^{1/2}$. Next, to gauge the performance of the statistical inference, we construct the 95% confidence interval for each parameter. For example, denote the estimated standard error of λ_g as $\widehat{\text{SE}}_{\lambda_g}^{(r)}$ for the r th replicate, then the 95% confidence interval for $\widehat{\lambda}_g^{(r)}$ is constructed as $\text{CI}_{\lambda_g}^{(r)} = (\widehat{\lambda}_g^{(r)} - 1.96 \times \widehat{\text{SE}}_{\lambda_g}^{(r)}, \widehat{\lambda}_g^{(r)} + 1.96 \times \widehat{\text{SE}}_{\lambda_g}^{(r)})$. Here $\widehat{\text{SE}}_{\lambda_g}^{(r)}$ is obtained by Theorem 4. Subsequently, the coverage probability (CP) is formed as $\text{CP}_{\lambda_g} = R^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^R I(\lambda_{g,0} \in \text{CI}_{\lambda_g}^{(r)})$. We calculate the CPs for other parameters similarly. For comparison, we also calculate the RMSE and CP values for the oracle estimators under the true group memberships (denoted as $\widehat{\lambda}_g^{\text{or}}, \widehat{\gamma}_h^{\text{or}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_g^{\text{or}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_h^{\text{or}}, \widehat{\alpha}_{gh}^{\text{or}}$ accordingly). Lastly, to evaluate the group memberships estimation, we calculate the mis-clustering rates for the row and col-

Table 1: True parameters for different scenarios.

Scenario 1		Scenario 2		Scenario 3	
$G_0 = 2$	$H_0 = 2$	$G_0 = 3$	$H_0 = 2$	$G_0 = 3$	$H_0 = 3$
λ_g (0.15, 0.2)	γ_h (0.25, 0.4)	λ_g (0.15, 0.2, 0.3)	γ_h (0.25, 0.3)	λ_g (0.15, 0.2, 0.3)	γ_h (0.25, 0.3, 0.4)
ζ_g $\begin{pmatrix} 0.2 & 0.25 & -0.3 \\ 0.15 & 0.35 & -0.35 \end{pmatrix}$	δ_h $\begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & -0.3 & 0.35 \\ 0.2 & -0.25 & 0.32 \end{pmatrix}$	ζ_g $\begin{pmatrix} 0.2 & 0.25 & -0.3 \\ 0.15 & 0.35 & -0.35 \\ 0.24 & 0.3 & -0.32 \end{pmatrix}$	δ_h $\begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & -0.3 & 0.35 \\ 0.2 & -0.25 & 0.32 \end{pmatrix}$	ζ_g $\begin{pmatrix} 0.2 & 0.25 & -0.3 \\ 0.15 & 0.35 & -0.35 \\ 0.24 & 0.30 & -0.32 \end{pmatrix}$	δ_h $\begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & -0.3 & 0.35 \\ 0.2 & -0.25 & 0.32 \\ 0.1 & -0.2 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix}$
α_{gh} $\begin{pmatrix} -0.2 & 0.3 \\ -0.18 & 0.35 \end{pmatrix}$		α_{gh} $\begin{pmatrix} -0.2 & 0.3 \\ -0.18 & 0.35 \\ -0.15 & 0.28 \end{pmatrix}$		α_{gh} $\begin{pmatrix} -0.2 & 0.3 & 0.4 \\ -0.18 & 0.35 & 0.4 \\ -0.15 & 0.28 & 0.2 \end{pmatrix}$	

umn groups as $\hat{\eta}_1 = (N_1 R)^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_i I(\hat{g}_i^{(r)} \neq g_i^0)$ and $\hat{\eta}_2 = (N_2 R)^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_j I(\hat{h}_j^{(r)} \neq h_j^0)$, where $\hat{g}_i^{(r)}$ is the estimated group membership of the i th node and $\hat{h}_j^{(r)}$ is defined similarly for the j th node. Here the mis-clustering rates are calculated after proper group permutations.

The simulation results are shown in Tables 2–4 under the three different combinations of group numbers. The first finding across all combinations is that once the group numbers are specified as the true values in advance, our iterative method can estimate the true group memberships with high accuracy especially when the sample size is large. As N_1, N_2 or T increase, the mis-clustering rates for either the row or the column groups reduce to around zero. Furthermore, we note that the RMSEs decrease either when the network sizes N_1 and N_2 increase or the time length T increases, and they approach the oracle RMSEs when the sample sizes are large. Next, we inspect the statistical inference results. We observe that the CPs for all parameters are stable around 0.95 in Tables 2 and 3, which reflects the high accuracy of the inference procedure. In Table 4, the CPs are slightly small when the sample sizes are not very large, but they grow up to around 0.95 as N_1, N_2 and T increase. This guarantees that even under the complex scenario where the number of parameters to be estimated is large, our proposed method can still perform well in terms of both estimation and inference for sufficiently large sample sizes.

5.2.2 Estimation when $G \geq G_0, H \geq H_0$

We next consider the case of estimation without specifying the true group numbers in advance. Specifically, we estimate the group numbers by QIC in Section 3.1, where the tuning parameter is set to be $\eta = 1/\{40\log(T)T^{1/8}\}$. Let the true group numbers be $G_0 = 3$ and $H_0 = 3$, and the corresponding true parameters are shown in Table 1. To evaluate the estimation accuracy, we calculate the RMSE for each parameter as explained below. Take $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ for example, define $\text{RMSE}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}, all} = \{(RN_1)^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\hat{g}_i^{(r)}} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{g_i}\|^2\}^{1/2}$ as the RMSE for all nodes. RMSE for other parameters are calculated similarly. For the group memberships, the mis-clustering rates are calculated following the idea of Zhu et al. (2022). Recall that we have

Table 2: RMSEs ($\times 100$) of estimated parameters under scenario 1 ($G_0 = 2, H_0 = 2$) with 500 replications. The performances are evaluated for different sample sizes N_1, N_2 and the time length T . Results under two network structures are provided. The corresponding CIs are shown in the parenthesis.

Network	G	H	N_1	N_2	T	$\hat{\lambda}$	$\hat{\gamma}$	$\hat{\zeta}$	$\hat{\delta}$	$\hat{\alpha}$	$\hat{\lambda}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\gamma}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\zeta}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\delta}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\alpha}^{\text{or}}$	η_1	η_2
SBM	2	2	100	80	20	7.8	7.5	8.6	8.7	8.3	7.7	7.5	8.5	8.7	8.2	0.0061	0
						(0.945)	(0.938)	(0.941)	(0.940)	(0.947)	(0.954)	(0.938)	(0.947)	(0.940)	(0.953)		
	2	2	200	150	20	5.2	5.2	5.9	6.1	5.7	5.2	5.2	5.9	6.1	5.7	0.0001	0
						(0.944)	(0.941)	(0.952)	(0.944)	(0.944)	(0.944)	(0.941)	(0.952)	(0.944)	(0.944)		
	2	2	300	250	20	3.9	4.0	4.4	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.4	4.5	4.3	0.0005	0
						(0.947)	(0.934)	(0.942)	(0.944)	(0.951)	(0.948)	(0.934)	(0.943)	(0.944)	(0.951)		
2	2	300	250	40	2.8	2.7	3.2	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.7	3.2	3.0	3.1	0	0	
					(0.946)	(0.939)	(0.943)	(0.949)	(0.943)	(0.946)	(0.939)	(0.943)	(0.949)	(0.943)			
Power-Law	2	2	100	80	20	2.5	2.4	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.9	2.8	2.7	0.0001	0
						(0.940)	(0.944)	(0.943)	(0.943)	(0.949)	(0.940)	(0.944)	(0.943)	(0.943)	(0.949)		
	2	2	100	80	40	1.8	1.6	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.9	1.9	1.8	0	0
						(0.942)	(0.957)	(0.955)	(0.948)	(0.958)	(0.942)	(0.957)	(0.955)	(0.948)	(0.958)		
	2	2	200	150	20	7.2	5.2	8.7	8.4	8.0	7.1	5.2	8.6	8.4	7.9	0.0056	0
						(0.948)	(0.933)	(0.943)	(0.940)	(0.943)	(0.949)	(0.934)	(0.946)	(0.940)	(0.948)		
2	2	200	150	40	4.3	3.6	6.0	6.0	5.4	4.3	3.6	6.0	6.0	5.4	0.0001	0	
					(0.946)	(0.949)	(0.944)	(0.945)	(0.946)	(0.946)	(0.949)	(0.944)	(0.945)	(0.946)			
2	2	300	250	20	3.4	1.6	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.4	1.6	4.4	4.4	3.9	0.0002	0	
					(0.943)	(0.954)	(0.947)	(0.945)	(0.938)	(0.945)	(0.954)	(0.946)	(0.945)	(0.939)			
2	2	300	250	40	2.4	1.7	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.4	1.7	3.0	3.1	2.8	0	0	
					(0.950)	(0.947)	(0.950)	(0.945)	(0.943)	(0.950)	(0.947)	(0.950)	(0.945)	(0.943)			
2	2	300	250	20	2.2	1.4	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.2	1.5	2.8	2.8	2.6	0	0	
					(0.949)	(0.934)	(0.940)	(0.942)	(0.945)	(0.948)	(0.933)	(0.940)	(0.942)	(0.946)			
2	2	300	250	40	1.6	1.0	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.0	1.9	1.9	1.7	0	0	
					(0.946)	(0.947)	(0.950)	(0.945)	(0.949)	(0.946)	(0.947)	(0.950)	(0.945)	(0.949)			

Table 3: RMSEs ($\times 100$) of estimated parameters under scenario 2 ($G_0 = 3, H_0 = 2$) with 500 replications. The performances are evaluated for different sample sizes N_1, N_2 and the time length T . Results under two network structures are provided. The corresponding CIs are shown in the parenthesis.

Network	G	H	N_1	N_2	T	$\hat{\lambda}$	$\hat{\gamma}$	$\hat{\zeta}$	$\hat{\delta}$	$\hat{\alpha}$	$\hat{\lambda}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\gamma}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\zeta}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\delta}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\alpha}^{\text{or}}$	η_1	η_2
SBM	3	2	100	80	20	11.7	7.6	13.1	8.9	13.0	11.4	7.6	12.9	8.9	12.8	0.0112	0
						(0.940)	(0.941)	(0.944)	(0.938)	(0.946)	(0.946)	(0.941)	(0.950)	(0.938)	(0.950)		
	40	7.8	5.2	9.3	6.3	11.3	7.7	5.2	9.2	6.1	8.9	0.0005	0.0020				
		(0.943)	(0.957)	(0.940)	(0.937)	(0.939)	(0.944)	(0.957)	(0.940)	(0.938)	(0.941)						
	20	200	150	20	5.7	3.8	6.8	4.4	6.5	4.4	6.5	0.0006	0				
		(0.940)	(0.943)	(0.946)	(0.945)	(0.946)	(0.940)	(0.943)	(0.946)	(0.945)	(0.947)						
40	300	250	40	3.9	2.7	4.6	3.0	4.4	3.0	4.4	0	0					
	(0.945)	(0.945)	(0.945)	(0.948)	(0.939)	(0.945)	(0.945)	(0.948)	(0.939)								
Power-Law	3	2	100	80	20	10.6	5.2	13.1	8.7	12.0	10.4	5.2	13.0	8.7	11.8	0.0088	0
						(0.939)	(0.946)	(0.944)	(0.933)	(0.944)	(0.942)	(0.945)	(0.950)	(0.934)	(0.948)		
	40	7.4	3.5	9.1	5.9	8.3	7.4	3.5	9.1	5.9	8.3	0.0003	0				
		(0.945)	(0.955)	(0.942)	(0.946)	(0.941)	(0.945)	(0.955)	(0.942)	(0.946)	(0.942)						
	20	200	150	20	5.5	2.5	6.6	4.4	6.1	4.4	6.1	0.0004	0				
		(0.943)	(0.936)	(0.944)	(0.939)	(0.944)	(0.943)	(0.936)	(0.944)	(0.939)	(0.945)						
40	300	250	40	4.0	1.1	4.7	3.1	4.2	3.1	4.2	0	0					
	(0.953)	(0.954)	(0.940)	(0.947)	(0.947)	(0.953)	(0.954)	(0.940)	(0.947)	(0.947)							
20	200	150	20	3.6	1.3	4.2	2.8	3.9	2.8	3.9	0	0					
	(0.943)	(0.937)	(0.942)	(0.936)	(0.942)	(0.943)	(0.937)	(0.942)	(0.936)	(0.942)							
40	300	250	40	2.3	1.0	2.9	1.9	2.6	1.9	2.6	0	0					
	(0.942)	(0.925)	(0.935)	(0.930)	(0.935)	(0.942)	(0.925)	(0.930)	(0.935)	(0.935)							

Table 4: RMSEs ($\times 100$) of estimated parameters under scenario 3 ($G_0 = 3, H_0 = 3$) with 500 replications. The performances are evaluated for different sample sizes N_1, N_2 and the time length T . Results under two network structures are provided. The corresponding CIs are shown in the parenthesis.

Network	G	H	N_1	N_2	T	$\hat{\lambda}$	$\hat{\gamma}$	$\hat{\zeta}$	$\hat{\delta}$	$\hat{\alpha}$	$\hat{\lambda}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\gamma}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\zeta}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\delta}^{\text{or}}$	$\hat{\alpha}^{\text{or}}$	η_1	η_2
SBM	3	3	100	80	20	25.6 (0.705)	12.5 (0.907)	59.1 (0.595)	15.9 (0.920)	58.6 (0.731)	11.7 (0.947)	10.8 (0.938)	13.6 (0.945)	12.9 (0.949)	19.1 (0.949)	0.1634	0.0113
					40	9.1 (0.911)	7.5 (0.945)	14.4 (0.871)	9.1 (0.948)	15.2 (0.913)	7.8 (0.951)	7.4 (0.945)	9.1 (0.938)	12.8 (0.947)	0.0285	0.0001	
	200	150	20	20	9.1 (0.825)	5.6 (0.925)	17.4 (0.805)	7.0 (0.940)	14.5 (0.857)	6.1 (0.932)	5.3 (0.939)	6.8 (0.940)	6.9 (0.942)	9.6 (0.945)	0.0524	0.0006	
				40	4.2 (0.942)	3.8 (0.939)	5.4 (0.940)	4.7 (0.949)	7.0 (0.941)	4.0 (0.948)	3.8 (0.941)	4.6 (0.950)	6.6 (0.948)	0.0033	0.0001		
	300	250	20	20	4.4 (0.916)	3.5 (0.935)	6.1 (0.906)	4.2 (0.941)	6.9 (0.920)	3.7 (0.948)	3.5 (0.936)	4.2 (0.946)	4.2 (0.941)	5.9 (0.944)	0.0092	0.0001	
				40	3.0 (0.930)	2.3 (0.948)	4.2 (0.927)	2.9 (0.952)	4.8 (0.936)	2.5 (0.947)	2.3 (0.950)	2.9 (0.948)	4.1 (0.948)	0.0006	0		
Power-Law	3	3	100	80	20	17.5 (0.769)	9.2 (0.931)	40.2 (0.687)	17.6 (0.923)	34.7 (0.790)	11.0 (0.938)	8.6 (0.941)	12.9 (0.948)	13.2 (0.944)	17.8 (0.947)	0.1361	0.0156
					40	11.4 (0.863)	5.7 (0.947)	20.0 (0.831)	9.3 (0.937)	19.5 (0.886)	7.2 (0.945)	5.6 (0.943)	9.3 (0.937)	13.2 (0.940)	0.0411	0	
	200	150	20	20	7.7 (0.843)	4.6 (0.939)	14.1 (0.840)	6.8 (0.945)	12.1 (0.883)	5.4 (0.937)	4.5 (0.945)	6.7 (0.947)	6.7 (0.946)	8.7 (0.950)	0.0408	0.0001	
				40	4.3 (0.933)	2.1 (0.948)	5.7 (0.927)	4.7 (0.948)	6.6 (0.940)	4.0 (0.946)	2.1 (0.949)	4.7 (0.948)	6.2 (0.948)	0.0039	0		
	300	250	20	20	4.7 (0.890)	2.4 (0.937)	7.8 (0.892)	5.4 (0.938)	10.7 (0.907)	3.3 (0.939)	2.1 (0.943)	4.2 (0.943)	4.2 (0.944)	5.5 (0.945)	0.0170	0.0001	
				40	2.7 (0.942)	1.9 (0.936)	3.2 (0.950)	2.9 (0.948)	4.1 (0.947)	2.6 (0.944)	1.9 (0.935)	2.9 (0.948)	4.0 (0.949)	0.0010	0		

$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g = \{i : \widehat{g}_i = g\}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_h = \{j : \widehat{h}_j = h\}$, where \widehat{g}_i and \widehat{h}_j are denoted as the estimated group membership for the i th and j th node. Note that G and H are not necessarily equal to G_0 and H_0 . In this case, we define the mappings from the estimated group memberships to the true group memberships $\chi_1 : \{1, \dots, G\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, G_0\}$ and $\chi_2 : \{1, \dots, H\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, H_0\}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_1(g) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{g' \in \{1, \dots, G_0\}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} I(i \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g, g_i^0 = g'), \quad g \in \{1, \dots, G\}, \\ \chi_2(h) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{h' \in \{1, \dots, H_0\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_2} I(j \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_h, h_j^0 = h'), \quad h \in \{1, \dots, H\}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the mapping $\chi_1(g)$ maps group g to the true membership g' where the majority of nodes in $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g$ belong to. Then, for the row group memberships, the mis-clustering rate in the r th replicate is defined as

$$\widehat{\xi}_1^{(r)} = N_1^{-1} \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i=1}^{N_1} I(i \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g^{(r)}, g_i^0 \neq \chi_1(g)),$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_g^{(r)}$ is the estimated node set belong to group g in the r th replicate. We define the mis-clustering rate for the column group as $\widehat{\xi}_2^{(r)}$ similarly. Then, the overall group memberships error rate is calculated as $\widehat{\xi}_1 = R^{-1} \sum_r \widehat{\xi}_1^{(r)}$ and $\widehat{\xi}_2 = R^{-1} \sum_r \widehat{\xi}_2^{(r)}$. Additionally, to evaluate the performance of the group selection criterion QIC, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho(G) &= R^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^R I(\widehat{G}^{(r)} = G), \\ \varrho(H) &= R^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^R I(\widehat{H}^{(r)} = H).\end{aligned}$$

for each G and H , where $\widehat{G}^{(r)}$ and $\widehat{H}^{(r)}$ are the estimated group numbers in the r th replicate. Both $\varrho(G)$ and $\varrho(H)$ assess the proportion of the correctly estimated group numbers for different G and H , and we wish to see a high ratio for $\varrho(G_0)$ and $\varrho(H_0)$. The results are shown in Table 5–6.

We discuss the results in Table 5 from two aspects. On one hand, when the group number is under-specified ($G = 2, H = 2$), the node-wise RMSEs are large and usually do not decrease when the N_1, N_2 and T grow. Besides, the error rates $\widehat{\xi}_1$ and $\widehat{\xi}_2$ are around 0.3, indicating a low accuracy in estimating node memberships. These results are expected since a non-ignorable estimation bias exists in an under-fitted model. On the other hand, when the group numbers G and H are correctly ($G = 3, H = 3$) or over-specified ($G = 4, H = 4$), the RMSE values are generally much lower. This is consistent with our theoretical analysis in Theorem 1. From Table 6, we also observe that the RMSEs decrease when N_1, N_2 and T increase. Moreover, both $\varrho(G)$ and $\varrho(H)$ tend to 1 for the correct model ($G = 3, H = 3$) when the sample size is large.

6 A Yelp Data Analysis

We now implement our proposed method to the dataset collected by the Yelp official website (<https://www.yelp.com/>). Yelp is a top review site for different kinds of business (i.e., restaurants, local retailers, entertainments, etc.) and also a social platform for users to share information. The goal is to analyze a user’s reviews regarding business/shops in different spatial districts.

6.1 Data Description

The Yelp dataset is collected from 2010 to 2018. For analysis purpose, we separate it into $T = 36$ quarters. The dataset includes four types of information, namely, user information (e.g., user registration time on Yelp), user’s friend relationship, shop information (e.g. spatial location), and user’s reviews on shops (including the “star” scores and review tags). See Figure 1 for an illustration of one user’s review on a restaurant named “Esther’s Kitchen” in Las Vegas. The user gave five stars to this restaurant, and the review was tagged 18 times by other users, including 8 “useful”, 3 “funny” and 7 “cool” tags. The restaurant gets 1611

Table 5: Simulation results for the two network examples with pre-specified group numbers as well as the QIC selection group numbers \hat{G} and \hat{H} . The true group numbers are set as $G_0 = H_0 = 3$. The node-wise RMSEs of different estimators are denoted as $\hat{\lambda}_{\text{all}}, \hat{\gamma}_{\text{all}}, \hat{\zeta}_{\text{all}}, \hat{\delta}_{\text{all}}, \alpha_{\text{all}}$.

N_1	N_2	T	G	H	Scenario 1 (SBM)						Scenario 2 (Power-Law)								
					$\hat{\lambda}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\gamma}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\zeta}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\delta}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\xi}_1$	$\hat{\xi}_2$	$\hat{\lambda}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\gamma}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\zeta}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\delta}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\alpha}_{\text{all}}$	$\hat{\xi}_1$	$\hat{\xi}_2$	
100		20	Oracle			0.0065	0.0059	0.0071	0.0070	0.0061	-	-	0.0072	0.0039	0.0071	0.0072	0.0060	-	-
			2	2	0.0285	0.0419	0.0427	0.0583	0.0368	0.3219	0.3125	0.0237	0.0438	0.0382	0.0647	0.0367	0.2705	0.3705	
			3	3	0.0207	0.0096	0.0251	0.0099	0.0174	0.1403	0.0142	0.0196	0.0129	0.0263	0.0114	0.0169	0.1487	0.0208	
			4	4	0.0192	0.0099	0.0181	0.0097	0.0172	0.0720	0.0042	0.0201	0.0134	0.0223	0.0101	0.0176	0.1046	0.0077	
			\hat{G}	\hat{H}	0.0278	0.0407	0.0416	0.0565	0.0358	-	-	0.0218	0.0374	0.0339	0.0554	0.0323	-	-	
100	80	40	Oracle			0.0044	0.0043	0.0050	0.0050	0.0043	-	-	0.0046	0.0040	0.0050	0.0049	0.0040	-	-
			2	2	0.0216	0.0436	0.0430	0.0503	0.0327	0.3100	0.2625	0.0210	0.0428	0.0403	0.0607	0.0361	0.2800	0.3375	
			3	3	0.0082	0.0070	0.0104	0.0063	0.0078	0.0366	0.0061	0.0069	0.0040	0.0085	0.0049	0.0053	0.0233	0	
			4	4	0.0081	0.0061	0.0084	0.0065	0.0084	0.0136	0.0006	0.0076	0.0066	0.0078	0.0067	0.0082	0.0101	0.0015	
			\hat{G}	\hat{H}	0.0086	0.0112	0.0121	0.0121	0.0100	-	-	0.0069	0.0040	0.0085	0.0049	0.0053	-	-	
200	150	20	Oracle			0.0034	0.0031	0.0036	0.0037	0.0031	-	-	0.0036	0.0021	0.0036	0.0037	0.0030	-	-
			2	2	0.0221	0.0431	0.0455	0.0592	0.0351	0.3505	0.3133	0.0217	0.0420	0.0416	0.0559	0.0351	0.3002	0.3200	
			3	3	0.0091	0.0037	0.0112	0.0040	0.0068	0.0504	0.0015	0.0076	0.0022	0.0089	0.0037	0.0054	0.0342	0.0001	
			4	4	0.0106	0.0052	0.0089	0.0054	0.0096	0.0296	0.0003	0.0086	0.0047	0.0082	0.0050	0.0077	0.0240	0.0004	
			\hat{G}	\hat{H}	0.0178	0.0334	0.0354	0.0457	0.0275	-	-	0.0076	0.0026	0.0089	0.0042	0.0056	-	-	
200	150	40	Oracle			0.0024	0.0021	0.0026	0.0026	0.0022	-	-	0.0023	0.0011	0.0025	0.0026	0.0020	-	-
			2	2	0.0199	0.0405	0.0383	0.0539	0.0343	0.2600	0.3133	0.0218	0.0409	0.0437	0.0554	0.0350	0.3250	0.3133	
			3	3	0.0029	0.0021	0.0034	0.0026	0.0026	0.0028	0.0001	0.0026	0.0011	0.0030	0.0026	0.0022	0.0027	0	
			4	4	0.0044	0.0038	0.0043	0.0040	0.0055	0.0047	0.0017	0.0049	0.0042	0.0045	0.0042	0.0057	0.0063	0.0032	
			\hat{G}	\hat{H}	0.0030	0.0027	0.0035	0.0034	0.0029	-	-	0.0026	0.0011	0.0030	0.0026	0.0022	-	-	

Table 6: The proportion of selected group numbers G and H in $R = 500$ replicates under different settings.

N_1	N_2	T	G	H	Scenario 1 (SBM)		Scenario 2 (Power-Law)	
					$\varrho(G)$	$\varrho(H)$	$\varrho(G)$	$\varrho(H)$
100	80	20	2	2	0.966	0.966	0.838	0.838
			3	3	0.034	0.034	0.162	0.162
			4	4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
		40	2	2	0.134	0.134	0.000	0.000
			3	3	0.866	0.866	1.000	1.000
			4	4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
200	150	20	2	2	0.756	0.756	0.010	0.010
			3	3	0.244	0.244	0.990	0.990
			4	4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
		40	2	2	0.016	0.016	0.000	0.000
			3	3	0.984	0.984	1.000	1.000
			4	4	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

reviews in total.




Figure 1: A review snapshot on the shop “Esther’s Kitchen”. It contains the user information, shop statistics, review text and the tags assigned to this review.

To analyze the data, we first focus our study on five cities with most business shops, namely, Charlotte, Las Vegas, Phoenix, Scottsdale and Toronto. Next, we keep the active users with more than 5 reviews across the time span. Then, we split each city as a grid into

Table 7: Descriptive statistics of Yelp dataset.

City	N_1	N_2	d_{user}	d_{dis}
Charlotte	240	60	0.0030	0.0593
Las Vegas	826	64	0.0009	0.0590
Phoenix	323	63	0.0021	0.0589
Scottsdale	391	60	0.0019	0.0599
Toronto	462	56	0.0016	0.0617

districts, which is shown in Figure 2. The number of active users and districts in each city (N_1 and N_2) are reported in Table 7. The response variable Y_{ijt} is the number of reviews from user i to district j in the t th quarter. To visualize the time trend of the reviews, we calculate the quarterly average response for each city, which leads to Figure 3. Different patterns can be observed. For example, Las Vegas receives highest number of reviews among all cities. This is closely related to its prosperous business environment. The basic dynamic trends for Charlotte, Phoenix, Scottsdale are roughly on the same level. For Toronto, we observe an obvious increase of the review numbers after the year 2015, which is related to the expanded business of Yelp in Toronto.

Next, we construct the adjacency matrices among the users (\mathbf{A}_1) and districts (\mathbf{A}_2) respectively as follows. The user network is built based on the friend list information. Specifically, if user j is on the friend list of user i on Yelp, then we set $a_{1ij} = 1$. Otherwise we set $a_{1ij} = 0$. The district network is built based on the geographical adjacent relationship. Specifically, we set $a_{2ij} = 1$ if the district j is adjacent to district i . We calculate the densities for the above two networks, i.e., $d_{\text{user}} = \sum_i \sum_j a_{1ij} / \{N_1(N_1 - 1)\}$ and $d_{\text{dis}} = \sum_i \sum_j a_{2ij} / \{N_2(N_2 - 1)\}$, which are shown in Table 7. One could observe that the user networks are quite sparse in all cities.

Lastly, to characterize the dynamic patterns of the responses, we collect a number of covariates for users and districts respectively. For user i in quarter t , we consider the following five covariates. They are, (1) the number of months after joining Yelp by the start of the quarter t ($x_{it,\text{dur}}$), (2) whether the user is VIP by the start of the quarter t ($x_{it,\text{vip}}$), (3)




Figure 2: Geographical maps with split districts in each city. The city from top left panel to bottom right panel show the map of Las Vegas, Toronto, Charlotte, Scottsdale, and Phoenix, respectively.




Figure 3: Average number of reviews from 2010-Q1 to 2018-Q4 in five cities.




Figure 4: Boxplots for response variable with regards to the users' covariates in Charlotte, Las Vegas, Phoenix, Scottsdale, and Toronto (displayed in each line). Specifically, the y-axis is the log-transformed average review number given by each user throughout the time span. The x-axis shows the corresponding high or low level for each covariate, separated by the median for continuous variables.

average tags (i.e., “useful”, “funny” and “cool”) the user i obtains for his/her reviews during the last quarter ($x_{it,use}, x_{it,fun}, x_{it,cool}$). Next, for the j th district in quarter t , we consider two covariates. They are, (1) the average “stars” ($z_{jt,star}$), and (2) the average review number ($z_{jt,num}$) obtained by the j th district during the $(t - 1)$ th quarter. These two covariates could reflect the average popularity level during the last time period. We next visualize the relationship between the response variable and the covariates related to the users in Figure 4. From the plot, we can observe that if a user obtained more tags for his/her reviews, the user tends to be stimulated to give more. In Scottsdale and Toronto, we find the VIP users tend to give more reviews; but on the contrary, VIP users in Charlotte behave inactively. Next, we implement the proposed GMNAR model to the five cities respectively, and study the group pattern in each city.

6.2 Estimation Results

We use QIC to select the group numbers and the estimation results are shown in Table 8–9. The numbers of user groups and district groups vary among the five cities. This implies a heterogeneous pattern across the cities. According to the results, most parameters in different groups are significant. Take the results in Phoenix for example. First, we find that the estimated $\hat{\alpha}$ values are all positive. This indicates a positive self-motivated effect of the users and the districts. Next, the estimated district (i.e., column) network effects are all positive. This implies a positive influence from the neighboring districts. One could find that $\hat{\gamma}_2 = 0.270$ is the largest among the two groups, meaning a strong neighbor effect. This means that the districts within this group are more closely related to the neighboring districts. However, the user (i.e., row) network effect in the first group is significantly negative ($\hat{\lambda}_1 = -0.02$), while the coefficients in other two groups are positive. This implies that the user activities in the first group are oppositely affected by their friends’ behaviors, while in other groups, users are still positively influenced by their friends.

Next, we study how the response is related to the user and district covariates. First,

for the user related covariates, we find that if a user gets more “useful” tags for his/her reviews during the last quarter, this user tends to write more reviews in the next quarter. This reflects the encouragement effect for users’ behavior, which means that the user may be more active if their comments are appreciated as “valuable” by others. Second, for the district related covariates, we find that if the districts get higher stars in the last quarter, they may attract more customers on this platform, hence increase the review number in the next quarter.

7 Concluding Remarks

In this work, we propose a group matrix network autoregression (GMNAR) model, which models the matrix-valued time series data with group structures. To conclude the article, we discuss three possible future research directions. First, instead of the additive model form considered in this work, we can model the row and column network effects in a multiplicative form, as considered by [Chen et al. \(2021\)](#). Second, one can consider an extension from the matrix time series data model to the tensor type time series, which can allow for more flexible modeling choices in practice. Third, to scrutinize the latent structure in a high dimensional scheme, a hidden factor structure can be imposed on the proposed GMNAR model, thus capturing more underlying information in the matrix-valued time series.

References

- Adamczak, R. (2015), “A note on the Hanson-Wright inequality for random vectors with dependencies,” *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 20, 1–13.
- Ando, T. and Bai, J. (2016), “Panel data models with grouped factor structure under unknown group membership,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31, 163–191.
- Bester, C. A. and Hansen, C. B. (2016), “Grouped effects estimators in fixed effects models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 190, 197–208.
- Bonhomme, S. and Manresa, E. (2015), “Grouped patterns of heterogeneity in panel data,” *Econometrica*, 83, 1147–1184.
- Chang, J., He, J., Yang, L., and Yao, Q. (2021), “Modelling matrix time series via a tensor CP-decomposition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.15423*.
- Chen, E. Y. and Chen, R. (2019), “Modeling dynamic transport network with matrix factor models: with an application to international trade flow,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.00769*.
- Chen, E. Y. and Fan, J. (2021), “Statistical inference for high-dimensional matrix-variate factor models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–18.
- Chen, E. Y., Tsay, R. S., and Chen, R. (2019), “Constrained factor models for high-dimensional matrix-variate time series,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- Chen, R., Xiao, H., and Yang, D. (2021), “Autoregressive models for matrix-valued time series,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 222, 539–560.
- Clauset, A., Shalizi, C. R., and Newman, M. E. (2009), “Power-law distributions in empirical data,” *SIAM Review*, 51, 661–703.
- Fan, J., Ke, Y., and Liao, Y. (2021), “Augmented factor models with applications to validating market risk factors and forecasting bond risk premia,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 222, 269–294.

- Guðmundsson, G. S. and Brownlees, C. (2021), “Detecting groups in large vector autoregressions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 225, 2–26.
- Hsu, N.-J., Huang, H.-C., and Tsay, R. S. (2021), “Matrix autoregressive spatio-temporal models,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 30, 1143–1155.
- Huang, D., Chang, X., and Wang, H. (2017), “Spatial autoregression with repeated measurements for social networks,” *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 1–13.
- Huang, D., Hu, W., Jing, B., and Zhang, B. (2023), “Grouped spatial autoregressive model,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 178, 107601.
- Ke, Z. T., Fan, J., and Wu, Y. (2015), “Homogeneity pursuit,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110, 175–194.
- Leng, C. and Tang, C. Y. (2012), “Sparse matrix graphical models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107, 1187–1200.
- Liu, R., Shang, Z., Zhang, Y., and Zhou, Q. (2020), “Identification and estimation in panel models with overspecified number of groups,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 215, 574–590.
- Lugosi, G. and Mendelson, S. (2019), “Sub-Gaussian estimators of the mean of a random vector,” *The annals of statistics*, 47, 783–794.
- Mao, X., Wong, R. K., and Chen, S. X. (2021), “Matrix Completion under Low-Rank Missing Mechanism,” *Statistica Sinica*, 2005–2030.
- Nowicki, K. and Snijders, T. A. B. (2001), “Estimation and prediction for stochastic block-structures,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 1077–1087.
- Ren, Y., Zhu, X., and Hu, G. (2021), “Graphical Assistant Grouped Network Autoregression Model: a Bayesian Nonparametric Recourse,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04991*.
- Samson, P.-M. (2000), “Concentration of measure inequalities for Markov chains and Φ -mixing processes,” *The Annals of Probability*, 28, 416–461.

- Su, L. and Ju, G. (2018), “Identifying latent grouped patterns in panel data models with interactive fixed effects,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 206, 554–573.
- Su, L., Shi, Z., and Phillips, P. C. (2016), “Identifying latent structures in panel data,” *Econometrica*, 84, 2215–2264.
- Su, L., Wang, X., and Jin, S. (2019), “Sieve estimation of time-varying panel data models with latent structures,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 37, 334–349.
- Walden, A. and Serroukh, A. (2002), “Wavelet analysis of matrix-valued time-series,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 458, 157–179.
- Wang, D., Liu, X., and Chen, R. (2019), “Factor models for matrix-valued high-dimensional time series,” *Journal of econometrics*, 208, 231–248.
- Wang, D., Zheng, Y., and Li, G. (2021a), “High-dimensional low-rank tensor autoregressive time series modeling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.04276*.
- Wang, D., Zheng, Y., Lian, H., and Li, G. (2021b), “High-dimensional vector autoregressive time series modeling via tensor decomposition,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–19.
- Wang, L., Kim, Y., and Li, R. (2013), “Calibrating non-convex penalized regression in ultra-high dimension,” *Annals of Statistics*, 41, 2505–2536.
- Wang, Y. J. and Wong, G. Y. (1987), “Stochastic blockmodels for directed graphs,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82, 8–19.
- Zhang, Y., Wang, H. J., and Zhu, Z. (2019), “Quantile-regression-based clustering for panel data,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 213, 54–67.
- Zhou, H. and Li, L. (2014), “Regularized matrix regression,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76, 463–483.

- Zhou, S. (2014), “Gemini: Graph estimation with matrix variate normal instances,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 42, 532–562.
- Zhu, X. and Pan, R. (2020), “Grouped network vector autoregression,” *Statistica Sinica*, 30, 1437–1462.
- Zhu, X., Pan, R., Li, G., Liu, Y., and Wang, H. (2017), “Network vector autoregression,” *Annals of Statistics*, 45, 1096–1123.
- Zhu, X., Xu, G., and Fan, J. (2022), “Simultaneous Estimation and Group Identification for Network Vector Autoregressive Model with Heterogeneous Nodes,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.12229*.