

MIXTURE CONDITIONAL REGRESSION WITH ULTRAHIGH DIMENSIONAL TEXT DATA FOR ESTIMATING EXTRALEGAL FACTOR EFFECTS

BY JIAXIN SHI^{1,a}, FANG WANG^{2,e}, YUAN GAO^{1,b},
XIAOJUN SONG^{1,c} AND HANSHENG WANG^{1,d}

¹*Guanghua School of Management, Peking University, Beijing, China, ajxshi@stu.pku.edu.cn; bygao_stat@outlook.com; csxj@gsm.pku.edu.cn; dhansheng@gsm.pku.edu.cn*

²*Data Science Institute, Shandong University, Jinan, China, wangfang226@sdu.edu.cn*

Testing judicial impartiality is a problem of fundamental importance in empirical legal studies, for which standard regression methods have been popularly used to estimate the extralegal factor effects. However, those methods cannot handle control variables with ultrahigh dimensionality, such as found in judgment documents recorded in text format. To solve this problem, we develop a novel mixture conditional regression (MCR) approach, assuming that the whole sample can be classified into a number of latent classes. Within each latent class, a standard linear regression model can be used to model the relationship between the response and a key feature vector, which is assumed to be of a fixed dimension. Meanwhile, ultrahigh dimensional control variables are then used to determine the latent class membership, where a Naïve Bayes type model is used to describe the relationship. Hence, the dimension of control variables is allowed to be arbitrarily high. A novel expectation-maximization algorithm is developed for model estimation. Therefore, we are able to estimate the interested key parameters as efficiently as if the true class membership were known in advance. Simulation studies are presented to demonstrate the proposed MCR method. A real dataset of Chinese burglary offenses is analyzed for illustration purpose.

1. Introduction. Our research is empirically motivated by studies of equality, impartiality, and justice in jurisprudence (L'Heureux-Dube, 2001; Meyerson, 2006). Fairness and justice have defined features of the judicial role, and include aspects such as substantive decision-making by judges (Weiler, 1968), procedural justice (Krehbiel and Cropanzano, 2000), judicial independence (Meron, 2005), and the proper assessment of scientific evidence (Edmond, 2002). We emphasize criminal substantive justice in this paper. This means that judicial decisions must follow the principle of legality and should not be affected by prejudice regarding races, incomes, and other extralegal factors (Bright, 2008; Lynch and Haney, 2011). Substantive justice represents the ultimate good of judicial impartiality. It is the core standard of good conduct and is essentially crucial for public confidence in the courts. In this regard, countries around the world have been promoting sustained reforms to unravel miscarriages of justice and safeguard judicial impartiality (Wadham, 1993; Stith et al., 1998; Ye, 2010). By doing so, people wish the extralegal factor effects on judicial impartiality can be controlled and minimized.

Despite the fact that judicial impartiality has been universally promoted over the world for a long history, bias and prejudice due to extralegal factors do exist in practice. In fact, this is one of the most important research areas in empirical legal studies (Nobles and Schiff, 1995; Roberts, 2003; Gross and Shaffer, 2012). Researchers have made enormous efforts to

Keywords and phrases: Expectation-maximization algorithm, judicial impartiality, mixture conditional regression, naïve bayes model, ultrahigh dimensional data.

document cases and analyze the reasons behind them. For example, [Mishler and Sheehan \(1993\)](#) studied about 4,000 cases from the U.S. Supreme Court database in the period of 1956–1989 and found that the Court has been highly responsive to public opinion. Its decisions have not only reflected the American public’s overall policy preferences, but reinforced and legitimized emerging majoritarian concerns. [Steffensmeier and Kramer \(1998\)](#) investigated 139,000 criminal conviction cases from Pennsylvania in 1989–1992 and found blacks and males to be more likely to be incarcerated and to receive longer sentences, even after controlling for the type and severity of the offense and the offender’s prior record. [Bushway and Piehl \(2001\)](#) analyzed 14,633 sentenced offenders from the state of Maryland and reported that African Americans had 20% longer sentences on average than whites, holding constant age, gender, and recommended sentence length from the guide. [Canes-Wrone, Clark and Kelly \(2014\)](#) studied 2,078 death penalty decisions issued by the U.S. state courts under four judicial selection systems between 1980 and 2006 and found that judges were significantly more responsive to majority opinions on capital sentences in nonpartisan election systems than partisan systems. [Glynn and Sen \(2015\)](#) examined 2,674 unique votes cast by 244 appeal judges from the U.S. Courts of Appeals on gender-related cases. They found that judges with daughters consistently tended to vote in a more feminist fashion on gender issues than judges with only sons. [Bielen and Grajzl \(2021\)](#) focused on 766 violent criminal cases that occurred during the 12-week interval around the day of Theo van Gogh’s assassination (November 2, 2004). They found that immediately afterward, the prospects of prosecution for unrelated violent crimes with male suspects born in Muslim-majority countries increased by about 19%.

To summarize, there have been ample amount of empirical studies of a possible dependent relationship between judicial decisions and the interested extralegal factors, after controlling for a number of legal factors. Such problems can be nicely formulated as a regression problem with both the main covariates of interest and a set of control variables. Specifically, the dependent variable (Y) is a judicial decision, the key variables (X_1) are extralegal factors (e.g., race, gender, public opinion), and the control variables (X_2) are legal factors (e.g., severity of the current offense, the offense type, the previous criminal record). Then, the interested problem becomes one of testing the statistical significance of the conditional regression relationship between Y and X_1 , after controlling for the effect of X_2 . Assuming that the law is perfectly just and self-contained and that no partiality or prejudice exists, we should expect Y and X_1 to be conditionally uncorrelated with each other, after controlling for the effect of X_2 .

To fix the idea, consider for example the study of Pennsylvania criminal conviction cases in 1989–1992 ([Steffensmeier and Kramer, 1998](#)), where the response variable (Y) is the decision whether to incarcerate an offender; the extralegal factors of interest (the main covariates X_1) include race, gender, age, and their interaction; and the legal characteristic variables (the control variables X_2) include the type and severity of the offense and the offender’s criminal record. To test the conditional regression relationship between Y and X_1 after controlling for X_2 , a standard logistic regression model was employed. In a recent study of criminal cases happened before and after Theo van Gogh’s assassination ([Bielen and Grajzl, 2021](#)), the dependent variable (Y) is the decision whether to prosecute a charge; the interested extralegal factors (the main covariates X_1) are the unrelated extraneous events (e.g., the Theo van Gogh’s assassination); and the legal factors (the control variables X_2) include the criminal history and type of charge. In this case, the difference-in-differences (DID) regression approach was used to study the conditional regression relationship between Y and X_1 , after controlling for the effect of X_2 . The literature suggests that testing conditional regression relationships should be of great importance for examining the effects of extralegal factors on judicial impartiality.

As one can see, to test the conditional regression relationship between the judicial decision (Y) and the extralegal factors (X_1), after controlling for the effects of legal factors (X_2), various standard regression models have been adopted for Y and (X_1, X_2) . Those regression methods are easy to implement and have a nice interpretation. However, they also suffer from one serious limitation. That is they can only handle control variables (X_2) with a relatively low dimension. For our empirical study of Chinese judicial decisions, the legal factors (X_2) contain features extracted from legal documents, which are lengthy text documents. Each element of the X_2 vector is then of a binary form, representing the existence or not of one particular keyword in the judgments. Since the original judgments are written in Chinese and contain a large number of legal issue-related keywords, the dimension of X_2 is very high, which precludes the immediate use of standard regression methods. Hence, how to test the conditional regression relationship between Y and X_1 with an ultrahigh dimensional X_2 becomes a problem of great importance.

Before we formally solve this problem, we consider splitting the original ultrahigh dimensional vector X_2 into two parts. The first part contains a subvector of X_2 , which has a fixed dimension and is strongly correlated with Y . In our case, this corresponds to those keywords in judgments that are not only high in frequency but highly correlated with the response variable Y . This is merged with X_1 to form a new feature vector X , which has a fixed dimension and a strong correlation with Y . Therefore, a standard regression model can be used to describe the regression relationship for Y and X . The remaining part of X_2 is formed as another new vector, Z , which has a very high dimension and is weakly correlated with the response variable Y . Since it is related to the response (even weakly), it does carry useful information for predicting it. However, since it is of ultrahigh dimension and is weakly related to the response, it can hardly be directly incorporated into a usual regression model structure. Then, how to effectively model the regression relationship between Y and (X, Z) with a fixed dimensional X and an ultrahigh dimensional Z becomes a key problem.

To solve this problem, we develop here a novel mixture conditional regression approach. Our method contains two important components. The first component is a mixture model. We assume that all the samples (i.e., legal cases) can be grouped into different classes. Within each group, a standard linear regression model can be assumed for Y and X . We allow the intercepts of those regression models to be class-specific, so that inter-class heterogeneity can be modeled. We force the regression coefficients of the main covariates to be the same across classes so that the overall main covariate effect can be quantified. As one can see, the main regression model assumed between Y and X for every class is low-dimensional. This makes the subsequent parameter estimation and statistical inference very easy. However, the main challenge here is that the class membership for every sample is a latent variable that is not directly observed. For our cases, the class membership is mainly determined by the judgments, which are represented by an ultrahigh dimensional binary vector. Therefore, it is theoretically appealing to assume for Z a Naïve Bayes type mixture model, so that the rich information contained in Z can be fully utilized to identify the latent membership for each sample.

To summarize, our model allow a feature vector to affect the response by two different mechanisms as follows. The first mechanism is simply including a feature as an usual explanatory variable. The strength of this mechanism is that it can provide the best explanatory power from X to Y in a very direct way. The weakness of this approach is that the dimension of X cannot be too large. Otherwise, we should suffer from the curse of dimensionality. The second mechanism is to relate a feature Z with the response but indirectly through the latent class membership. The weakness of this approach is that the feature cannot affect the response directly. Therefore, the explanatory power is sacrificed to some extent. However, the strength of this approach is that it can easily accommodate as many features as possible. This

leads to an interesting phenomenon, that is the blessing of dimensionality. Simply speaking, each mechanism has its own strength and weakness theoretically. Therefore, they need to be treated differently in practice.

For convenience, we refer to our model as a mixture conditional regression (MCR) model. To estimate it, we develop here a novel estimation method. It contains four steps. We show theoretically that the resulting estimators can be statistically as efficient as the oracle estimators, which are obtained by assuming that the latent class membership is known in advance. Extensive simulation studies are presented to demonstrate the finite sample performance of this method. A real data example of 6,118 judgments is analyzed for illustration purpose. The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 develops the MCR model, including the four-step estimators and their asymptotic statistical properties. Simulation studies are presented in Section 3 and a real data example of judgments is analyzed in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 concludes with a brief discussion. All technical details are relegated to the Appendix.

2. Methodology.

2.1. A statistical model. Let (Y_i, X_i) with $1 \leq i \leq n$ be the observation collected from the i -th subject. Here $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^1$ is the response of interest. In our case, it is the log-transformed sentence length and it is assumed to follow a continuous distribution. In the meanwhile, $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{iq})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is the associated main covariates. To model their regression relationship, we assume that

$$(2.1) \quad Y_i = \sum_{k=1}^K I(\mathcal{K}_i = k) \gamma_k + X_i^\top \theta + \varepsilon_i,$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is an indicator function, $\mathcal{K}_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ is a latent categorical variable identifying the latent class membership of the i -th legal document, γ_k is an associated unknown coefficient, $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_q)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is the regression coefficient associated with confounding factors, and ε_i is random noise, which we assume to follow a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . It is noteworthy that we allow different intercepts γ_k according to class, so that the inter-class heterogeneity can be modeled. In the meanwhile, we assume the same coefficient θ for different classes, so that the overall main covariate effect can be quantified.

We next consider how to model the dependence relationship between the latent class membership and the ultrahigh dimensional binary feature vector $Z_i = (Z_{i1}, \dots, Z_{ip})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $Z_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$. Specifically, Z_{ij} is defined to be 1 if a prespecified keyword appears in the i -th legal document and otherwise is 0. To model the dependence relationship between \mathcal{K}_i and Z_i , a classical Naïve Bayes model ([Spiegelhalter and Knill-Jones, 1984](#)) is assumed. Specifically, we assume that Z_i and (Y_i, X_i) are conditionally independent with \mathcal{K}_i given. We also assume that Z_{ij} s for $1 \leq j \leq p$ are mutually conditionally independent given \mathcal{K}_i . Mathematically, this jointly means that

$$P(Z_i | \mathcal{K}_i = k, Y_i, X_i) = P(Z_i | \mathcal{K}_i = k) = \prod_{j=1}^p P(Z_{ij} | \mathcal{K}_i = k) = \prod_{j=1}^p p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1 - Z_{ij}},$$

where $p_{kj} = P(Z_{ij} = 1 | \mathcal{K}_i = k)$. Finally, we assume the class prior probability $P(\mathcal{K}_i = k) = \pi_k$. Recall that ε_i follows a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . Write $\phi(\gamma_k + X_i^\top \theta, \sigma^2) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\}$. Then, a log-likelihood function can be written as

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{L}(\Theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \phi(\gamma_k + X_i^\top \theta, \sigma^2) \prod_{j=1}^p p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1 - Z_{ij}} \right\},$$

where $\Theta = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma^2, \text{vec}(P)^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1+pK}$, $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$, and $P = (p_{kj}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times p}$. For an arbitrary matrix A with dimension $M \times N$, $\text{vec}(A)$ stands for an $MN \times 1$ column vector defined by stacking the columns of the matrix A on top of one another. Then the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) can be obtained as $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{mle}} = (\hat{\pi}_{\text{mle}}^\top, \hat{\gamma}_{\text{mle}}^\top, \hat{\theta}_{\text{mle}}^\top, \hat{\sigma}_{\text{mle}}^2, \text{vec}(\hat{P}_{\text{mle}})^\top)^\top = \text{argmax}_{\Theta} \mathcal{L}(\Theta)$.

2.2. Identifiability, interestingness and relevance. To estimate the the model (2.2), it is crucial to ensure its identifiability. As one can see, if the response Y is integrated out, we are then left with binary feature Z and the covariate X only. In this case, the identifiability becomes a serious issue. Non-identifiable examples can be easily constructed. Therefore, for model identification purpose, we cannot integrate Y out. Instead, we need to make full use of Y for model identification purpose. To fix this idea, consider for example a highly simplified case with Y observed only (even without the binary feature vector Z), then the model (2.2) reduces to a standard mixture regression model. As pointed out by [Shalabh et al. \(2008\)](#), this model can be nicely identified under appropriate regularity conditions; see section 3 in [Shalabh et al. \(2008\)](#). This discussion suggests that even with the information Y only, we are able to identify the latent class membership in a probabilistic way. By supplying Y with additional information from Z , the identifiability can be further improved. Once the latent class membership is identified, the parameters p_{kj} s associated Z can be estimated. This explains why when we develop our initial estimator for Ω in the next subsection, the response Y must be always involved.

As one can see, the statistical model (2.2) developed in Section 2.1 is a natural extension of the classical mixture linear regression model ([De Veaux, 1989](#); [Wedel et al., 2000](#)). We modify this model slightly so that a large number of binary features can be included for a more accurate identification of the latent class membership. This extension is theoretically interesting due to the following reasons. First, this is an extension of the classical model from fixed-dimensional data to high-dimensional ones. Second, this allows us to extend the application of the classical mixture linear regression from structured data to unstructured text data, which are represented by a ultrahigh dimensional binary feature vector. Lastly, while the mainstream of the statistical literature complains about the curse of dimensionality, our model setup makes the high dimensionality a blessing. That is higher feature dimension leads to more accurate identification of the latent class membership.

We then apply our methodology to the study of judicial impartiality. This is a problem of fundamental importance for empirical legal studies. In this regard, a lot of statistical methods have been developed ([Steffensmeier and Kramer, 1998](#); [Bushway and Piehl, 2001](#); [Glynn and Sen, 2015](#); [Peng and Cheng, 2022](#)). The key feature of all those methods is to quantify the effect of the primary covariate of interest (e.g., ethnic, gender, age), after controlling for the confounding effects of legal factors. It is remarkable that most traditional statistical methods cannot handle ultrahigh dimensional data. Therefore, only a fixed number of legal factors can be included for controlling their confounding effects. That leaves ample amount of information contained in the legal documents in text format completely ignored. On the other side, this part of information is extremely useful for controlling the confounding effects of legal factors. Then how to solve this problem becomes practically important or even emergent. That inspires our methodology.

2.3. An initial estimator. We next consider how to practically estimate the model (2.1), which has a rather sophisticated structure and a large number of unknown parameters. It can hardly be optimized in a straightforward way by for example a standard Newton-Raphson algorithm. Thus, directly optimizing the joint log-likelihood function (2.2) might be practically extremely challenge or even infeasible. To solve this problem, we develop here an

interesting estimation method, which starts with an initial estimator for the linear regression part and then progresses to a more sophisticated and also accurate final estimator. We are to show that this is a computationally more feasible solution with guaranteed statistical property. Specifically, if we focus on observations $\{(Y_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ only, we should have a log-likelihood function given by

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{L}(\Omega) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \phi(\gamma_k + X_i^\top \theta, \sigma^2) \right\},$$

where $\Omega = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma^2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$ is a finite dimensional parameter and $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is different from (2.2) with a slight abuse of notation. Therefore, an estimator for Ω can be defined as $\hat{\Omega} = (\hat{\pi}^\top, \hat{\gamma}^\top, \hat{\theta}^\top, \hat{\sigma}^2)^\top = \operatorname{argmax}_{\Omega} \mathcal{L}(\Omega)$. To compute this estimator, we wish to obtain its first-order conditions. Note that π_k must be optimized under the constraint $\sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k = 1$. We conduct the classical method of Lagrange multipliers (Breusch and Pagan, 1980; Engle, 1984). Then the first-order conditions for Ω are given by

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_k &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{ik} \right) / n \\ \gamma_k &= \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^\top \theta) \omega_{ik} \right\} / \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{ik} \right) \\ \theta &= \left(X^\top X \right)^{-1} X^\top (Y - V) \\ \sigma^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \left(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta \right)^2 \omega_{ik} / n, \end{aligned}$$

where $X = (X_1^\top, \dots, X_n^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$, $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $V = (V_1, \dots, V_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $V_i = \sum_{k=1}^K \omega_{ik} \gamma_k$, and $\omega_{ik} = P(\mathcal{K}_i = k | Y_i, X_i) = \pi_k \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\} / \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\} \right]$ is the posterior probability of the i -th observation being the k -th class with limited information and we have $\sum_{k=1}^K \omega_{ik} = 1$.

Next, we turn this set of first-order conditions (2.4) into a classical expectation-maximization (EM) type of algorithm (Dempster, Laird and Rubin, 1977; Bilmes et al., 1998; Reynolds, 2009). Specifically, let $\hat{\Omega}^{(0)} = (\hat{\pi}^{(0)\top}, \hat{\gamma}^{(0)\top}, \hat{\theta}^{(0)\top}, \hat{\sigma}^{2(0)})^\top$ be an arbitrarily specified initial estimator. For example, we can set $\hat{\pi}_k^{(0)} = 1/K$, $\hat{\gamma}^{(0)} = 0$, $\hat{\theta}^{(0)} = 0$, and $\hat{\sigma}^{2(0)} = 1$. Write $\hat{\Omega}^{(t)} = (\hat{\pi}^{(t)\top}, \hat{\gamma}^{(t)\top}, \hat{\theta}^{(t)\top}, \hat{\sigma}^{2(t)})^\top$ as the estimator obtained in the t -th step. Following the idea of the classical EM algorithm, the next step, to update $\hat{\Omega}^{(t+1)}$ is given by

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_k^{(t+1)} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\omega}_{ik}^{(t)} \right) / n \\ \hat{\gamma}_k^{(t+1)} &= \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\theta}^{(t)}) \hat{\omega}_{ik}^{(t)} \right\} / \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\omega}_{ik}^{(t)} \right) \\ \hat{\theta}^{(t+1)} &= \left(X^\top X \right)^{-1} X^\top (Y - V^{(t)}) \\ \hat{\sigma}^{2(t+1)} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \left(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}_k^{(t)} - X_i^\top \hat{\theta}^{(t)} \right)^2 \hat{\omega}_{ik}^{(t)} / n, \end{aligned}$$

where $V^{(t)} = (V_1^{(t)}, \dots, V_n^{(t)})^\top$, $V_i^{(t)} = \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{\omega}_{ik}^{(t)} \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(t)}$, and $\widehat{\omega}_{ik}^{(t+1)} = \widehat{\pi}_k^{(t)} \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(t)} - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}^{(t)})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2(t)) \right\} / \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{\pi}_k^{(t)} \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k^{(t)} - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}^{(t)})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2(t)) \right\} \right]$.

2.4. Estimating the response probability. We next consider how to estimate the response probability p_{kj} for every k and j . To this end, we consider the joint log-likelihood function for (Y_i, X_i) and Z_{ij} as

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{L}^{(j)}(\Theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \phi \left(\gamma_k + X_i^\top \theta, \sigma^2 \right) p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} \left(1 - p_{kj} \right)^{1-Z_{ij}} \right\},$$

where the superscript “ j ” means that the log-likelihood is related to Z_{ij} . Ideally, we should optimize $\mathcal{L}^{(j)}(\Theta)$ with respect to all unknown parameters (i.e., π_k , γ_k , θ , σ^2 , and p_{kj}). It can be directly optimized by for example a Newton-Raphson type iterative algorithm. The associate computational cost should be practically very acceptable for a fixed j . However, if the feature dimension p is large, the total computational cost becomes much heavier. We are then inspired to search for computationally more efficient alternative. In fact, with the help of the initial estimator $\widehat{\Omega} = (\widehat{\pi}^\top, \widehat{\gamma}^\top, \widehat{\theta}^\top, \widehat{\sigma}^2)^\top$ given in the previous subsection, we can simply replace $\Omega = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma^2)^\top$ by its initial estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$. This leads to a simplified log-likelihood function

$$(2.7) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{\pi}_k \phi \left(\widehat{\gamma}_k + X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\sigma}^2 \right) p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} \left(1 - p_{kj} \right)^{1-Z_{ij}} \right\},$$

where $p_j = (p_{1j}, \dots, p_{Kj})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$, and $\widehat{\Omega}$ is fixed. Therefore, an estimator for p_j can be defined as $\widehat{p}_j = (\widehat{p}_{1j}, \dots, \widehat{p}_{Kj})^\top = \operatorname{argmax}_p \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p)$. To compute this estimator, we can obtain the first-order condition for p_{kj} as follows,

$$(2.8) \quad p_{kj} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\pi}_{ik}^{(j)} Z_{ij} \right\} / \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\pi}_{ik}^{(j)} \right\},$$

where $\widehat{\pi}_{ik}^{(j)} = \widehat{\pi}_k \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\} \left(\widehat{p}_{kj} \right)^{Z_{ij}} \left(1 - \widehat{p}_{kj} \right)^{1-Z_{ij}} / \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{\pi}_k \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\} \left(\widehat{p}_{kj} \right)^{Z_{ij}} \left(1 - \widehat{p}_{kj} \right)^{1-Z_{ij}} \right]$. Then, we can immediately obtain the EM algorithm for p_{kj} as follows. By doing so, we can make full use of this analytical formula (2.8) so that the algorithm is no longer iterative between Ω and p_j . Consequently, the computational cost can be significantly reduced. Similar to the previous subsection, let $\widehat{p}_{kj}^{(0)}$ be an arbitrarily specified initial estimator, such as $\widehat{p}_{kj}^{(0)} = 1/2$ for every k and j . Write $\widehat{p}_{kj}^{(t)}$ be the estimator obtained in the t -th step. Then, the next step to update $\widehat{p}_{kj}^{(t+1)}$ is

$$(2.9) \quad \widehat{p}_{kj}^{(t+1)} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\pi}_{ik}^{(j,t)} Z_{ij} \right\} / \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\pi}_{ik}^{(j,t)} \right\},$$

where $\widehat{\pi}_{ik}^{(j,t+1)} = \widehat{\pi}_k \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\} \left(\widehat{p}_{kj}^{(t)} \right)^{Z_{ij}} \left(1 - \widehat{p}_{kj}^{(t)} \right)^{1-Z_{ij}} / \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{\pi}_k \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\} \left(\widehat{p}_{kj}^{(t)} \right)^{Z_{ij}} \left(1 - \widehat{p}_{kj}^{(t)} \right)^{1-Z_{ij}} \right]$.

Note that the initial estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$ is the standard M-estimator, which we know is \sqrt{n} -consistent under appropriate regularity conditions (Vaart, 1998; Shao, 2003). Then, we can

further prove that $\hat{p}_j = (\hat{p}_{1j}, \dots, \hat{p}_{Kj})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is also \sqrt{n} -consistent for every j . To study the theoretical properties of \hat{p}_j over every j , we shall focus on the log-likelihood function $\mathcal{L}^{(j)}(p_j)$. The first- and second- order partial derivatives of $\mathcal{L}^{(j)}(p_j)$ with respect to p_j are given by $\dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = \partial \mathcal{L}^{(j)}(p_j) / \partial p_j \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and $\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = \partial^2 \mathcal{L}^{(j)}(p_j) / (\partial p_j \partial p_j^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, respectively. Write $\dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = (\dot{\ell}_1^{(j)}, \dots, \dot{\ell}_K^{(j)})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and $\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = (\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$. Let $\alpha_{ik}^{(j)} = c_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1 - Z_{ij}} / \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1 - Z_{ij}}$, and $c_{ik} = \pi_k (\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^{-1} \exp \left\{ - \left(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta \right)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\}$. Define $s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) = Z_{ij} / p_{kj} - (1 - Z_{ij}) / (1 - p_{kj})$.

It can be verified that $\dot{\ell}_k^{(j)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ik}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj})$ and $\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)} = - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})$. Define $I(p_j) = -E \{ n^{-1} \ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) \} = -E \{ n^{-1} (\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)}) \} = (\mathcal{E}^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, where $\mathcal{E}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n E(c_{ik_1} c_{ik_2} / M_{ij})$, and $M_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} p_{kj} \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} (1 - p_{kj})$.

Let A be an arbitrary matrix with dimension $M \times N$. Define its norm as $\|A\| = \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(A^\top A) = \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(AA^\top)$, where $\lambda_{\max}(B)$ stands for the maximal eigenvalue of an arbitrary symmetric matrix B . Similarly, write $\lambda_{\min}(B)$ as the minimal eigenvalue of B . Write $\pi_{\min} = \min_k \pi_k$ and $\pi_{\max} = \max_k \pi_k$ with $0 < \pi_{\min} \leq \pi_{\max} < 1$. Write $\gamma_{\max}^2 = \max_k \gamma_k^2 > 0$. Then, the uniform consistency for \hat{p}_j over every j can be established by Theorem 1, which is proved in Appendix B.1. By Theorem 1, we know that \hat{p}_j is uniformly consistent for p_j over $1 \leq j \leq p$. The uniform convergence rate is slightly slower than the standard rate of \sqrt{n} by a slowly diverging factor C_n .

THEOREM 1. *Assume the technical conditions (C1), (C2) and (C3) as given in Appendix A hold. Furthermore, assume that $C_n > 0$ is an arbitrary positive sequence such that: (I) $C_n / \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ and (II) $C_n^2 / \log(p) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We then have $\max_j \|\hat{p}_j - p_j\| = O_p(C_n / \sqrt{n})$.*

2.5. Class membership identification. With the help of the response probability estimators, we are able to estimate the latent class membership with extra-ordinarily high accuracy. This is mainly because the feature dimension p is extremely high. That leads to an ample amount of information for class membership identification. Specifically, we are still interested in estimating the posterior probability for $\mathcal{K}_i = k$ but with (Y_i, X_i, Z_i) information given. Write $a_{ik} = I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)$ and $\pi_{ik} = P(\mathcal{K}_i = k | Y_i, X_i, Z_i)$. Then direct computation suggests that

$$(2.10) \quad \pi_{ik} = \frac{\pi_k \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta \right)^2 \right\} \prod_{j=1}^p p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1 - Z_{ij}}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta \right)^2 \right\} \prod_{j=1}^p p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1 - Z_{ij}}}.$$

Next, we can replace the unknown parameters in (2.10) by the estimators given in Sections 2.3 and 2.4. This leads to another estimator for the posterior probability for each observation i as given by

$$(2.11) \quad \hat{\pi}_{ik} = \frac{\hat{\pi}_k \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2\hat{\sigma}^2} \left(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \hat{\theta} \right)^2 \right\} \prod_{j=1}^p \hat{p}_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - \hat{p}_{kj})^{1 - Z_{ij}}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\pi}_k \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{2\hat{\sigma}^2} \left(Y_i - \hat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \hat{\theta} \right)^2 \right\} \prod_{j=1}^p \hat{p}_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - \hat{p}_{kj})^{1 - Z_{ij}}}.$$

Note that the same posterior probability was also evaluated in Section 2.3 but with (Y_i, X_i) information only, which is denoted by ω_{ik} . Note that, the feature involved in ω_{ik} has a fixed

dimension and thus there is very limited information. Therefore, the posterior estimator ω_{ik} provided in (2.4) cannot be consistent for a_{ik} . In other words, the difference between ω_{ik} and a_{ik} will not converge to 0 even if $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, the story dramatically changes for the new posterior estimator $\hat{\pi}_{ik}$, for which we assume that $p \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, a sufficient amount of information can be accumulated for the latent class membership \mathcal{K}_i . As a direct consequence, it is more likely to be consistent for a_{ik} . In fact, this conjecture is formally verified by Theorem 2, whose proof is given in Appendix B.2. From this, we know that the posterior probability estimator $\hat{\pi}_{ik}$ is extremely close to the true membership indicator function $a_{ik} = I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)$, with a tiny error of order $O(\exp(-\nu p))$. This makes the subsequent estimator and inference for the main regression model of Y and X very easy.

THEOREM 2. *Assume the technical conditions (C1)–(C6) as given in Appendix A hold. Then, for an arbitrary constant $0 < \nu < \Delta_{\min}/2$, where Δ_{\min} is defined in Condition (C5), there exists a positive constant $M > 0$ such that $P\left\{\max_{i,k} |\hat{\pi}_{ik} - I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)| > \exp(-\nu p)\right\} = o(1)$ as long as $p > M$.*

2.6. The final main estimator. By Theorem 2, we know that the true class membership can be consistently estimated by $\hat{\pi}_{ik}$ with super excellent accuracy. As a consequence, we should be able to re-estimate the interested regression parameter $\Omega = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma^2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$ with much-improved estimation accuracy. Define $X_i^a = (a_i^\top, X_i^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K+q}$, where $a_i = (a_{i1}, \dots, a_{iK})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Recall that $\sum_{k=1}^K a_{ik} = 1$. Specifically, if the latent class membership \mathcal{K}_i is known in advance, we should estimate the linear regression model parameters by minimizing the following classical least squares (OLS) objective function as $\mathcal{L}(\Phi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K a_{ik} (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^{a\top} \Phi)^2$, where $\Phi = (\gamma^\top, \theta^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K+q}$. By optimizing $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$ with respect to Φ , we obtain $\hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\Phi} \mathcal{L}(\Phi) = \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xy}}$, where $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^a X_i^{a\top}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xy}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^a Y_i$.

As one can see, $\hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}$ is an oracle estimator, which cannot be practically computed, since the latent class membership \mathcal{K}_i is not directly observed. However, by Theorem 2, we know that this binary indicator random variable $a_{ik} = I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)$ can be estimated consistently and accurately by $\hat{\pi}_{ik}$. We are then motivated to approximate X_i^a by X_i^π , where $X_i^\pi = (\hat{\pi}_i^\top, X_i^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K+q}$, and $\hat{\pi}_i = (\hat{\pi}_{i1}, \dots, \hat{\pi}_{iK})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Then, a practically feasible estimator can be constructed as $\hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} = \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xy}}$, where $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\pi X_i^{\pi\top}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xy}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\pi Y_i$. Thereafter, an oracle estimator for σ^2 can be defined as $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^{a\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}})^2 / n$. Once $\hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}}$ is obtained, $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2$ can be estimated as $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{real}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^{\pi\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2 / n$. Lastly, we define the final estimator for π_k as $\hat{\pi}_{\text{real}} = (\hat{\pi}_{\text{real},1}, \dots, \hat{\pi}_{\text{real},K})$, where $\hat{\pi}_{\text{real},k} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\pi}_{ik}\right) / n$, and its ideal counterpart as $\hat{\pi}_{\text{oracle}} = (\hat{\pi}_{\text{oracle},1}, \dots, \hat{\pi}_{\text{oracle},K})$, where $\hat{\pi}_{\text{oracle},k} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_{ik}\right) / n$. Recall that $\Omega = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma^2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$. Then, we can immediately have the real estimator $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{real}} = (\hat{\pi}_{\text{real}}^\top, \hat{\gamma}_{\text{real}}^\top, \hat{\theta}_{\text{real}}^\top, \hat{\sigma}_{\text{real}}^2)^\top$ and the oracle estimator $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}} = (\hat{\pi}_{\text{oracle}}^\top, \hat{\gamma}_{\text{oracle}}^\top, \hat{\theta}_{\text{oracle}}^\top, \hat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2)^\top$. Theorem 3 characterizes the difference between the real and oracle estimator, from which we find that the resulting estimator enjoys the same convergence rate and asymptotic distribution as its ideal counterpart, which is defined by assuming that \mathcal{K}_i is known in advance. The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Appendix B.3.

THEOREM 3. *Assume that the technical conditions (C1)–(C6) as given in Appendix A hold. Then, we have $\|\widehat{\Omega}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$.*

3. Simulation studies.

3.1. The simulation setup. To demonstrate the finite sample performance of the proposed MCR method, we performed a number of simulation studies. Specifically, we would like to study the finite sample performance of (a) the initial estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$; (b) the response probability estimators \widehat{p}_j s; (c) the class membership identification estimators $\widehat{\pi}_{ik}$ s; and (d) the final main estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{\text{real}}$. For the entire simulation study, we considered various sample sizes with $n = 1,000, 2,000, \text{ or } 5,000$. For each n , the dimension of the binary feature vector was set to be $p = n/10, n/5, n/2, n, \text{ or } 2n$. Once n and p are given, following Tibshirani (1996), we generated $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $q = 8$ from a multivariate normal distribution with mean 0 and $\text{cov}(X_{ij_1}, X_{ij_2}) = \rho^{|j_1 - j_2|}$ with $\rho = 0.5$ for $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq 8$. The number of classes was fixed at $K = 5$ (Vermunt and Magidson, 2002). The true value of $\Theta = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma^2, \text{vec}(P)^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1+Kp}$ was set at $\pi = (0.15, 0.2, 0.3, 0.25, 0.1)^\top$, $\gamma = (-4, -1, 2, 5, 8)^\top$, $\theta = (3, 1.5, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, 0)^\top$, $\sigma^2 = 1$, and $P = (p_{kj}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times p}$. Here the matrix P was divided into K^2 block matrices, where the block diagonal elements were generated from a uniform distribution between 0.8 and 0.95, and other elements were generated from a uniform distribution between 0.01 and 0.3. Then, $Z_i = (Z_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ could be generated. The residual term ε_i was independently generated from a standard normal distribution. This leads to the final response variable Y_i according to the model (2.1).

3.2. The initial estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$. We start with the initial estimator $\widehat{\Omega} = (\widehat{\pi}^\top, \widehat{\gamma}^\top, \widehat{\theta}^\top, \widehat{\sigma}^2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$. For a given sample size n and binary feature dimension p , the experiment was randomly replicated for a total of $R = 500$ times. We use $\widehat{\tau}^{(r)}$ to represent one particular estimator (e.g., $\widehat{\theta}^{(r)}$) obtained in the r -th replication ($1 \leq r \leq R$). The true parameter is denoted by τ . Then, the estimator error (Err) can be evaluated as $\text{Err} = \|\widehat{\tau}^{(r)} - \tau\|$ for every $1 \leq r \leq R$. This leads to a total of R Err values, which are then log-transformed and box-plotted in Figure 1. By Figure 1, we find that, for essentially every estimator of interest (i.e., $\widehat{\pi}$, $\widehat{\gamma}$, $\widehat{\theta}$, and $\widehat{\sigma}^2$), large sample sizes always lead to smaller estimation errors. This numerical finding confirms that the initial estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$ is indeed consistent.

3.3. The response probability estimator \widehat{p}_j . Next, we study $\widehat{p}_j \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Similarly, we can compute for each \widehat{p}_j an Err value decoded by Err_j ($1 \leq j \leq p$) and its maximum error (MaxErr) over j is given by $\text{MaxErr} = \max_j \text{Err}_j$. Recall that we have $R = 500$ random replications. This leads to a total of R MaxErr values, which are then log-transformed and box-plotted in Figure 2. By Figure 2, we obtain the following two interesting findings. First, for a fixed p , we find that the larger the sample size n , the smaller the maximum error (MaxErr). This confirms that \widehat{p}_j is uniformly consistent for p_j over $1 \leq j \leq p$. Second, with a fixed sample size n , the maximum error (MaxErr) seems to be slightly larger as p increases. This interesting numerical finding suggests that the uniform convergence rate of \widehat{p}_j is slightly slower than the standard rate of \sqrt{n} if $p \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. All these results are in line with our theoretical findings in Theorem 1.

3.4. The posterior probability estimator $\widehat{\pi}_{ik}$. We then study $\widehat{\pi}_{ik}$. Recall that $\widehat{\pi}_{ik}$ estimates the latent class membership. We are extremely interested in evaluating the difference between $\widehat{\pi}_{ik}$ and the true membership indicator function $a_{ik} = I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)$. Thus, we can compute $\text{Err}_{i,k} = |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}|$ for every i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) and k ($1 \leq k \leq K$), whose maximum error




FIG 1. $\log(\text{Err})$ values for various initial estimators: $\hat{\pi}$ (the upper left panel), $\hat{\gamma}$ (the upper right panel), $\hat{\theta}$ (the lower left panel), and $\hat{\sigma}^2$ (the lower right panel). Three different sample sizes are considered. They are $n = 1000$, 2000 and 5000 respectively.




FIG 2. $\log(\text{MaxErr})$ values for the response probability estimator \hat{p}_j . Different panels correspond to different feature dimensions: $p = 1000$ (the left panel), 2000 (the middle panel), and 5000 (the right panel). For a given panel, different boxplots correspond to different sample sizes with $n = 1000$, 2000 and 5000, respectively.

(MaxErr) over i and k is given by $\text{MaxErr} = \max_{i,k} \text{Err}_{i,k}$. Similarly, this leads to a total of R MaxErr values, which are then log-transformed and box-plotted in Figure 3. By Figure 3, we find that with a fixed sample size n , a larger p leads to smaller MaxErr values. The larger the p value is, the more feature information can be provided and thus the more accurate the posterior probability could be. This results verify that the feature information helps us to estimate the latent class membership with extra-ordinarily high accuracy, which is in line with our theoretical findings in Theorem 2.

3.5. *The final main estimator $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{real}}$.* Finally, recall that $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{real}}$ is a practically feasible estimator to approximate the oracle estimator $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}$. Thus, we would like to study the difference between $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{real}}$ and $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}$, as evaluated by $\text{Diff} = \|\hat{\Omega}_{\text{real}} - \hat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}\|$. Similarly, this leads to a total of R Diff values in log-scale, which are then box-plotted in Figure 4. By Figure 4, we find




FIG 3. $\log(\text{MaxErr})/(p/100)$ values for the posterior probability estimator $\hat{\pi}_{ik}$. Different panels correspond to different sample sizes: $n = 1000$ (the left panel), 2000 (the middle panel), and 5000 (the right panel). For a given panel, different boxplots correspond to different feature dimensions with $p = 100, 200$ and 500 , respectively.




FIG 4. $\log(\text{Diff})$ values between $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{real}}$ and $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}$ with the feature dimension $p = 100$. Different boxplots correspond to different sample sizes.

that for a fixed small feature dimension p (e.g., $p = 100$), the larger the sample size n , the smaller the mean error. Furthermore, the difference between $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{real}}$ and $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}$ rapidly shrinks to an extremely tiny value as n increases. In fact, for a slightly large p (e.g., $p = 200$) and a reasonably large sample size (e.g., $n = 500$), the Diff values are too tiny to be distinguished from 0 due to the limited precision of a computer system. This indicates that $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{real}}$ is almost identical to $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}$. All these results are in line with our theoretical findings in Theorem 3.

3.6. A BIC method for K . The simulation results presented in the previous subsections are based on the assumption that the true number of latent classes (i.e., K) is known in advance. Unfortunately, this is an unknown parameter that need be estimated. To this end, we follow the idea of Schwarz (1978) and develop here a BIC method. Specifically, let K_{max} be the maximum number of latent classes to be considered. For example, various K_{max} values (e.g., 10 and 20) have been considered. The resulting numerical performance is nearly identical. Therefore, we fix $K_{\text{max}} = 10$ for the rest of the simulation study. Next, for any $1 \leq K \leq K_{\text{max}}$, the interested model parameters can be es-

TABLE 1
Percentage (%) of experiments with different n and p .

$n \backslash p$	10	50	100	200	500	1000
200	36.2%	28.2%	28.0%	25.0%	26.0%	25.4%
500	89.2%	85.0%	84.0%	83.8%	83.4%	84.4%
1000	98.0%	97.6%	98.0%	97.0%	97.2%	97.2%
2000	100%	99.6%	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%	99.8%

estimated and denoted as $\widehat{\Theta}^{(K)} = \left(\widehat{\pi}^{(K)\top}, \widehat{\gamma}^{(K)\top}, \widehat{\theta}^{(K)\top}, \widehat{\sigma}^{2(K)\top}, \text{vec}(\widehat{P}^{(K)}) \right)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d^*}$ with $d^* = K + K + q + 1 + pK = 2K + q + 1 + pK$. Then, a BIC selection criterion can be developed as

$$(3.1) \quad \text{BIC}(K) = -2 \sum_{j=1}^p \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{\pi}_k^{(K)} \phi \left(\widehat{\gamma}_k^{(K)} + X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}^{(K)}, \widehat{\sigma}^{2(K)} \right) \left(\widehat{p}_{kj}^{(K)} \right)^{Z_{ij}} \left(1 - \widehat{p}_{kj}^{(K)} \right)^{1-Z_{ij}} \right\} \right] + \text{df} \times \log(n)$$

where $\text{df} = d^* - 1 = 2K + q + pK$ is the degree of freedom due to the whole parameter $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d^*}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k = 1$, and the penalization factor ($\text{df} \times \log(n)$) is due to the seminal work of Schwarz (1978). Therefore, the optimum K can be estimated as $\widehat{K} = \text{argmin}_{1 \leq K \leq K_{\max}} \text{BIC}(K)$. Following the simulation setting in the previous subsections, this experiment was randomly replicated $R = 500$ times. The percentage of the experiments with $\widehat{K} = K = 5$ is shown in Table 1. As one can see, for any fixed feature dimension p , the percentage of experiments with $\widehat{K} = K = 5$ converges to 100% rapidly as the sample size n increases. This suggests that \widehat{K} should be a consistent estimator of K .

4. Real data analysis.

4.1. *The China Judgments Online data.* We present here a real case study. The dataset is obtained from *China Judgments Online* (CJO). The full dataset contains a total of 1,361,354 cases that happened in China from 2017 to 2018. For illustration purpose, we study here the criminal cases only. This is mainly because the CJO dataset is a highly unbalanced dataset, with sample sizes varying considerably by crime. Obviously, we cannot work on crimes with extremely tiny sample sizes. In the meanwhile, past literature suggests that theft is one of the most common crimes worldwide (Sheley and Ashkins, 1981; Felson and Boba, 2010). It happens that this is also the case for our CJO dataset, where theft accounts for about 24.44% of all cases (Simmons and Flood-Page, 2002; Xu et al., 2022). For illustration purpose, we take burglaries in theft-related cases as an example. It accounts for about 13.59% of all theft cases. Moreover, to render our analysis in a more straightforward way, only those first trials and fixed-term imprisonment cases without any missing information are kept. This leads to a final sample size of $n = 6,118$ cases.

For each case, the CJO dataset collects a judgment document written in Chinese, including the defendant's demographic characteristics, the court's findings of major facts, and the court's sentencing decisions (Simmons and Flood-Page, 2002). The defendant's demographic characteristics are typically included in the first paragraph of the judgement documents. It typically contains important information, such as age, gender, and ethnicity. See for example the top box in Figure 5. The court's findings of major facts locate in the judgment between

刑事判决书

(2017)*0402刑初317号

公诉机关**市**区人民检察院。

被告人**，男，1995年5月7日出生，汉族，初中文化，无职业，**市人，住**市**区。2016年6月因犯盗窃罪被**市**区人民法院判处有期徒刑六个月，并处罚金人民币三千元。

被告人**对公诉机关指控的犯罪事实及罪名均无异议。

经审理查明，被告人**于2017年8月13日7时30分，在**市**区***网吧，趁被害人**睡觉之机，将其放在电脑桌上的一部OPPOR9SK金色手机盗走，尔后逃离现场。经估价鉴定，被盗手机价值人民币1500元。随后被告人**来到**市**区手机市场，正欲行销赃时，因发现其手机可疑，被群众带至公安机关，被告人**在明知前往公安机关是去核实手机情况，其仍自愿配合到公安机关接受调查，当公安人员对其盘查时，其主动交待了盗窃手机的犯罪事实。案发后，所盗手机被公安人员依法扣押，并已返还被害人。

本院认为，被告人**曾因盗窃被判刑一次，但仍不思悔改，又以非法占有为目的，盗窃他人财物，且数额已达到盗窃数额较大标准的百分之五十，其行为已构成盗窃罪，依法应予惩处…本院依据《中华人民共和国刑法》第二百六十四条…判决如下：

被告人**犯盗窃罪，判处有期徒刑六个月，并处罚金人民币3000元。

(罚金自判决生效之日起执行。刑期自判决执行之日起计算…即被告人**刑期自2017年8月13日起至2018年2月12日止。)

如不服本判决，…

FIG 5. An arbitrarily selected judgment example. The top box includes the defendant's demographic characteristics. The middle box presents the court's findings of major facts. The bottom box shows the court's sentencing decisions.

'This trial is now ended' and 'Our court holds that'. See for example the middle box in Figure 5. Lastly, the court's sentencing decisions are shown in the paragraph beginning with 'The judgement is as follows'. See for example the bottom box in Figure 5.

4.2. *Variable description.* The primary variable of interest in our study is the length of the prison sentence, reported in months. We take the log-transformed length of the prison sentence as our response variable Y_i for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. We next consider a set of five extralegal factors (i.e., X_{1i}) available in our CJO dataset. These are mainly the demographic variables of the defendants, including age, gender, ethnicity, employment status, and education level. All variables are coded as dummies except for age. Age of the defendant (X_{1i1}) is measured in years, with values ranging from 16 to 78 years. The mean age is about 33.7 years, with a standard deviation of 9.8 years. Gender (X_{1i2}) is coded as $X_{1i2} = 1$ for males and $X_{1i2} = 0$ for females. More than ninety percent (97.7%) of the defendants in our sample are males. For ethnicity (X_{1i3}), we represent Han Chinese by $X_{1i3} = 1$, and other minorities by $X_{1i3} = 0$. More than three-quarters (85.4%) of the defendants are Han Chinese. Employment status (X_{1i4}) is coded as $X_{1i4} = 1$ if the defendant is employed and $X_{1i4} = 0$ otherwise. About 38.4% of the defendants are employed. Lastly, the education level is coded as $X_{1i5} = 1$ if the defendant is in elementary school (42.7%), $X_{1i6} = 1$ for junior middle school (40.6%), and $X_{1i7} = 1$ for high school or above (7.7%). Illiterate defendants (9.0%) are coded as $X_{1i5} = X_{1i6} = X_{1i7} = 0$. This leads to the extralegal factor vector $X_{1i} \in \mathbb{R}^7$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Next, we extract keywords from criminal facts as legal factors, i.e., control variable $X_{2i} = (X_{2ij})$ with $X_{2ij} \in \{0, 1\}$. To this end, we first cut the Chinese judgment documents into keywords and then compute their frequencies. For illustration purpose, only those keywords with a frequency of more than 10 times are kept. These account for about 4.8% of the total number of keywords but 95.99% of the total frequency. Among those keywords, there are

many keywords, which are very high in frequency but have little actual meaning. Those keywords are then excluded from our subsequent analysis. Those excluded keywords include for example ‘the defendant’, ‘the victim’, ‘the plaintiff’, and ‘the Public Prosecution Service’. This leads to a final set of 6,578 keywords. We then code for each keyword as a dummy variable X_{2ij} , whose value is 1 if the j -th keyword actually appears in the i -th document and is 0 otherwise. Follow the idea of the proposed MCR method, we then split X_{2i} into two parts. The first part contains a set of keywords that are not only high in frequency but also high in correlation with Y . In the meanwhile, the size of the first part is determined by the BIC score in the standard linear regression, with a final size of 64. This subvector of X_{2i} is then merged with X_{1i} , so that the main covariates $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $q = 71$ can be formed. Then, the rest of X_{2i} is formed as $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, with $p = 6,514$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.

4.3. *The estimation results.* To apply the proposed MCR method, we first estimate the number of the latent classes (i.e., K), using the BIC selection criterion (3.1) proposed in Section 3.6. Specifically, we fix $K_{\max} = 20$. This leads to the final estimate $\hat{K} = \operatorname{argmin}_{1 \leq K \leq K_{\max}} \operatorname{BIC}(K) = 7$. Subsequently, we fix $K = \hat{K} = 7$ so that the main parameters of interest can be estimated. As we are most interested in estimating the effects of extralegal factors on judicial impartiality, our interpretation should focus on X_j ($1 \leq j \leq 7$) only, since they are related to these factors. The detailed estimation results are summarized in the left panel of Table 2. Note that the reported standard errors (SE) in Table 2 are computed by simply treating $\hat{\pi}_{ik}$ s as fixed. By Theorem 2, we know that the estimated posterior probability $\hat{\pi}_{ik}$ should converge to the true membership indicator function $a_{ik} = I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)$ with super fast convergence rate. This fact has been numerically verified in Section 3.5, see Figure 4. Therefore, the difference between $\hat{\pi}_{ik}$ and a_{ik} becomes asymptotically ignorable. Consequently, the ‘‘simple’’ standard errors estimator as reported in Table 2 is indeed a statistically valid estimator for the asymptotic variance. By Table 2 and focusing on the 5% level of significance, we find that X_1 (Age) and X_3 (Ethnicity) seem to be statistically significant. Consider, for example, the age effect. The corresponding coefficient of X_1 is 0.0012, indicating that those at an older age tend to receive longer sentences, even after controlling for the effects of legal factors, as reflected in Z_i . Specifically, holding all other factors fixed, if the age of the defendant is increased by 10 years, the average sentence is expected to be about 1.21% longer.

For the sake of comparison, the results of ordinary linear regression (OLR) model is also presented. For the OLR model, a linear regression model is directly fitted for Y_i and X_i , when the information contained in Z_i is completely ignored. The detailed results are summarized in the right panel of Table 2. The OLR results seem to suggest that the gender of the defendant (i.e., X_2) and the education level (i.e., X_6 , junior middle school) are also statistically significant. Consider, for example, the gender effect. By OLR results, we find that males tend to receive longer average sentences than females. However, after conditioning on the legal factors, as reflected in Z_i by MCR, this effect becomes no longer statistically significant. Therefore, it seems to us that the seemingly significant gender effect as detected by the OLR method is very questionable. It might due to the fact that male defendants are often involved in more severe criminal acts. Once those legal factor effects are well controlled by Z_i , this seemingly significant gender effect disappears.

To further support the MCR method, we next demonstrate that the MCR method also leads to more accurate prediction results than the typically used OLR method. To this end, we randomly split the whole CJO dataset into a training dataset (50%) and a testing dataset (50%). Here we use $\mathcal{T} = \{(X_i^*, Y_i^*, Z_i^*) : 1 \leq i \leq n^*\}$ to represent the testing dataset. Consider an arbitrary testing sample $(X_i^*, Y_i^*, Z_i^*) \in \mathcal{T}$. By model (2.1), we should have $E(Y_i^* | X_i^*, Z_i^*) = \sum_{k=1}^K I(\mathcal{K}_i = k) \gamma_k + X_i^{*\top} \theta$. Since the value of Y_i^* should

TABLE 2
Estimation results of MCR model and OLR model.

Variable	MCR			OLR		
	Estimate	SE	P-value	Estimate	SE	P-value
X_1 (Age)	0.0012	0.001	0.042	0.0016	0.001	0.032
X_2 (Male)	0.0662	0.039	0.088	0.1081	0.048	0.025
X_3 (Han)	-0.0633	0.017	0.000	-0.0761	0.021	0.000
X_4 (Employed)	-0.0118	0.012	0.324	-0.0002	0.015	0.988
X_5 (Elementary)	0.0361	0.021	0.092	0.0574	0.027	0.031
X_6 (Middle)	0.0214	0.022	0.326	0.0432	0.027	0.110
X_7 (High)	-0.0381	0.029	0.184	0.0040	0.036	0.911

not be known in advance, we need to define a new posterior probability estimator as $\hat{\pi}_{ik}^* = \hat{\pi}_k \prod_{j=1}^p \hat{p}_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - \hat{p}_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}} / \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\pi}_k \prod_{j=1}^p \hat{p}_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - \hat{p}_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}}$. Thereafter, a predictor for Y_i^* can be constructed as $\hat{Y}_i^* = \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\pi}_{ik}^* \hat{\gamma}_k + X_i^{*\top} \hat{\theta}$, where the unknown parameters are estimated on the training dataset by the final estimator $\hat{\Phi} = (\hat{\gamma}^\top, \hat{\theta}^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K+q}$. Accordingly, the out-of-sample R -squared (OR) can be evaluated as

$$\text{OR} = \left\{ 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n^*} (Y_i^* - \hat{Y}_i^*)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n^*} (Y_i^* - \bar{Y}_i^*)^2} \right\} \times 100\%,$$

where $\bar{Y}_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^{n^*} Y_i^* / n^*$. For a reliable evaluation, this experiment was randomly replicated for $M = 100$ times. This leads to a total of M OR values, which are then box-plotted in Figure 6; see the left boxplot in Figure 6. Repeating the experiment for the OLR method with the interested response Y_i^* predicted by $\hat{Y}_i^{*(\text{OLR})} = \hat{\gamma}^{(\text{OLR})} + X_i^{*\top} \hat{\theta}^{(\text{OLR})}$, where $\hat{\gamma}^{(\text{OLR})}$ and $\hat{\theta}^{(\text{OLR})}$ are the ordinary least squared estimators obtained on the training dataset. That leads to the right boxplot in Figure 6. We find that the MCR method outperforms the OLR method clearly. The median of OR in OLR method is about 43.00%, while that of MCR is about 48.19%, which is almost 5.2% better than OLR. Therefore, it supports that, by utilizing information provided by Z_i appropriately, the MCR method should be a very useful regression tool for testing judicial impartiality.

5. Concluding remarks. To summarize, we aim to provide here two important contributions to the existing literature. First, we provide the statistics literature a new regression tool for testing the interested conditional independence, when there exists an ultrahigh dimensional and binary control variable. Second, we provide the legal study literature, a new perspective for testing judicial impartiality and demonstrate its usefulness on a large-scale Chinese burglary judgment dataset. To conclude this article, we wish to discuss a few interesting new topics for future study. First, the MCR method assumes that the rich information contained in Z_i is represented by a binary feature vector. By doing so, the existence of a bag of keywords can be well represented. Nevertheless, the associated frequency information is completely ignored. Then, how to take the frequency information into consideration should be a good topic for further study (Kononenko, 1991; Kim et al., 2006). Second, we treat an EM algorithm as if it sufficiently converge if the difference between two consecutive estimates is sufficiently small. Our numerical experiments suggest that this simple method works fairly well. However, whether the final estimator obtained by our EM algorithm indeed converges numerically to the global optimizer is not theoretically investigated and thus not guaranteed in this work. A further research along this line seems quite involved and should be a




FIG 6. Out-of-sample R -squared (OR) values for the two competing models. The left and right boxplots represent the MCR and OLR methods, respectively.

good topic for future studies (Xu and Jordan, 1996; Bilmes et al., 1998; Balakrishnan, Wainwright and Yu, 2017). Third, the number of latent classes K is estimated by a BIC selection criterion here, which our preliminary numerical experiments suggest that this BIC method works fairly well. However, its theoretical properties remain unknown. Then how to fill this important theoretical gap is another interesting direction for future exploration (Biernacki, Celeux and Govaert, 2000; Zhao, Jin and Shi, 2015). Finally, the current MCR method can be viewed as a natural extension of the ordinary linear regression models. How to develop similar methods for many other popularly used generalized regression models (e.g., logistic regression) is also worth pursuing (Jansen, 1993; Sedghi, Janzamin and Anandkumar, 2016).

REFERENCES

- BALAKRISHNAN, S., WAINWRIGHT, M. J. and YU, B. (2017). Statistical guarantees for the EM algorithm: From population to sample-based analysis.
- BERNSTEIN, S. (1926). *Leçons sur les propriétés extrémales et la meilleure approximation des fonctions analytiques d'une variable réelle*. Gauthier-Villars.
- BIELÉN, S. and GRAJZL, P. (2021). Prosecution or persecution? extraneous events and prosecutorial decisions. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* **18** 765–800.
- BIERNACKI, C., CELEUX, G. and GOVAERT, G. (2000). Assessing a mixture model for clustering with the integrated completed likelihood. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **22** 719–725.
- BILMES, J. A. et al. (1998). A gentle tutorial of the EM algorithm and its application to parameter estimation for Gaussian mixture and hidden Markov models. *International Computer Science Institute* **4** 126.
- BREUSCH, T. S. and PAGAN, A. R. (1980). The Lagrange multiplier test and its applications to model specification in econometrics. *The Review of Economic Studies* **47** 239–253.
- BRIGHT, S. B. (2008). The failure to achieve fairness: race and poverty continue to influence who dies. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Constitutional Law* **11** 23.
- BUSHWAY, S. D. and PIEHL, A. M. (2001). Judging judicial discretion: legal factors and racial discrimination in sentencing. *Law and Society Review* 733–764.
- CANES-WRONE, B., CLARK, T. S. and KELLY, J. P. (2014). Judicial selection and death penalty decisions. *American Political Science Review* **108** 23–39.
- CHERNOFF, H. (1952). A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 493–507.
- DE VEAUX, R. D. (1989). Mixtures of linear regressions. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **8** 227–245.
- DEMPSTER, A. P., LAIRD, N. M. and RUBIN, D. B. (1977). Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **39** 1–22.

- EDMOND, G. (2002). Constructing miscarriages of justice: misunderstanding scientific evidence in high profile criminal appeals. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* **22** 53-89.
- ENGLE, R. F. (1984). Wald, likelihood ratio, and Lagrange multiplier tests in econometrics. *Handbook of Econometrics* **2** 775–826.
- FAN, J. and LI, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **96** 1348-1360.
- FELSON, M. and BOBA, R. L. (2010). *Crime and everyday life*. Sage.
- GLYNN, A. N. and SEN, M. (2015). Identifying judicial empathy: does having daughters cause judges to rule for women’s issues? *American Journal of Political Science* **59** 37–54.
- GROSS, S. and SHAFFER, M. (2012). Exonerations in the united States.
- JANSEN, R. (1993). Maximum likelihood in a generalized linear finite mixture model by using the EM algorithm. *Biometrics* 227–231.
- KIM, S.-B., HAN, K.-S., RIM, H.-C. and MYAENG, S. H. (2006). Some effective techniques for naive bayes text classification. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **18** 1457-1466.
- KONONENKO, I. (1991). Semi-naive bayesian classifier. In *European Working Session on Learning* 206–219. Springer.
- KREHBIEL, P. J. and CROPANZANO, R. (2000). Procedural justice, outcome favorability and emotion. *Social Justice Research* **13**.
- L’HEUREUX-DUBE, C. (2001). Beyond the myths: qquality, impartiality, and justice. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*.
- LYNCH, M. and HANEY, C. (2011). Mapping the racial bias of the white male capital juror: Jury composition and the “Empathic Divide”. *Law and Society Review* **45** 69-102.
- MERON, T. (2005). Judicial independence and impartiality in international criminal tribunals. *American Journal of International Law* **99** 359-369.
- MEYERSON, D. (2006). *Understanding jurisprudence (1st ed.)*. Routledge-Cavendish.
- MISHLER, W. and SHEEHAN, R. S. (1993). The Supreme Court as a countermajoritarian institution? The impact of public opinion on Supreme Court decisions. *American Political Science Review* **87** 87–101.
- NOBLES, R. and SCHIFF, D. (1995). Miscarriages of justice: a systems approach. *The Modern Law Review* **58** 299.
- PENG, Y. and CHENG, J. (2022). Ethnic disparity in Chinese theft sentencing. *China Review* **22** 47–71.
- REYNOLDS, D. A. (2009). Gaussian mixture models. *Encyclopedia of Biometrics* **741**.
- ROBERTS, S. (2003). ‘Unsafe’ convictions: defining and compensating miscarriages of justice. *The Modern Law Review* **66** 441–451.
- SCHWARZ, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics* 461–464.
- SEDGHI, H., JANZAMIN, M. and ANANDKUMAR, A. (2016). Provable tensor methods for learning mixtures of generalized linear models. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* 1223–1231. PMLR.
- SHALABH, HEUMANN, C., GRÜN, B. and LEISCH, F. (2008). Finite mixtures of generalized linear regression models. *Recent Advances in Linear Models and Related Areas: Essays in Honour of Helge Toutenburg* 205–230.
- SHAO, J. (2003). *Mathematical statistics*. Springer New York, NY.
- SHELEY, J. F. and ASHKINS, C. D. (1981). Crime, crime news, and crime views. *Public Opinion Quarterly* **45** 492–506.
- SIMMONS, J. and FLOOD-PAGE, C. (2002). *Crime in England and Wales*. Home Office London.
- SPIEGELHALTER, D. J. and KNILL-JONES, R. P. (1984). Statistical and knowledge-based approaches to clinical decision-support systems, with an application in gastroenterology. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (General)* **147** 35-58.
- STEFFENSMEIER, J. T. U. DARRELL and KRAMER, J. (1998). The interaction of race, gender, and age in criminal sentencing: the punishment cost of being young, black, and male. *Criminology* **36** 763-798.
- STITH, K., CABRANES, J. A. et al. (1998). *Fear of judging: sentencing guidelines in the federal courts*. University of Chicago Press.
- TIBSHIRANI, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **58** 267–288.
- VAART, A. W. v. D. (1998). *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- VERMUNT, J. K. and MAGIDSON, J. (2002). Latent class cluster analysis. *Applied Latent Class Analysis* **11** 60.
- WADHAM, J. (1993). Unravelling miscarriages of justice. *New Law Journal* **143** 1650–1650.
- WANG, H. (2009). Forward regression for ultra-high dimensional variable screening. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **104** 1512-1524.
- WEDEL, M., KAMAKURA, W. A., WEDEL, M. and KAMAKURA, W. A. (2000). *Mixture regression models*. Springer.

- WEILER, P. (1968). Two models of judicial decision-making. *The Canadian Bar Review* **46** 406.
- XU, L. and JORDAN, M. I. (1996). On convergence properties of the EM algorithm for Gaussian mixtures. *Neural Computation* **8** 129–151.
- XU, K., LIU, H., WANG, F. and WANG, H. (2022). ‘This crime is not that crime’-classification and evaluation of four common crimes. *Law, Probability and Risk* **20** 135–152.
- YE, X. (2010). The impact and direction of national standardized sentencing reform in China. *Columbia Journal of Asian Law* **24** 247.
- ZHAO, J., JIN, L. and SHI, L. (2015). Mixture model selection via hierarchical BIC. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **88** 139–153.

APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL CONDITIONS

In this Appendix, we give some useful technical conditions for the subsequent theorems. To establish the sophisticated asymptotic theory for the proposed method, the following technical conditions are necessarily needed. Specifically, condition **(C1)** is a standard regularity condition, which assumes that the fisher information matrix $I(p_j)$ is positive definite over $1 \leq j \leq p$. Condition **(C2)** assumes that the true parameters p_{kj} s are uniformly bounded. A similar condition can be found in [Kononenko \(1991\)](#) and [Kim et al. \(2006\)](#). By conditions **(C3)** and **(C4)**, we allow the feature dimension p to diverge as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in a moderate rate. Condition **(C5)** requires that the distributions of binary features belonging to two different classes exhibit certain differences. Condition **(C6)** is a standard distribution assumption in high-dimensional data analysis (?).

- (C1)** Assume that there exists some fixed constant $\tau_{\min} > 0$ such that $\min_j \lambda_{\min}\{I(p_j)\} \geq \tau_{\min}$.
- (C2)** Assume that there exist some positive constants $0 < p_{\min} \leq p_{\max} < 1$ such that $p_{\min} \leq \min_{k,j} p_{k,j} \leq \max_{k,j} p_{k,j} \leq p_{\max}$.
- (C3)** Assume that $p \rightarrow \infty$ and $\log(p)/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (C4)** Assume that $\log(n)/p \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (C5)** Assume that $\Delta_{\min} > 0$, where $\Delta_{\min} = \min_{k_1 \neq k_2} \left[-p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p \left\{ p_{k_1 j} \log(p_{k_2 j}/p_{k_1 j}) + (1 - p_{k_1 j}) \log((1 - p_{k_2 j})/(1 - p_{k_1 j})) \right\} \right]$.
- (C6)** Assume that X_{ij} follows a sub-Gaussian distribution for each $1 \leq j \leq q$, where $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{iq}) \in \mathbb{R}^q$.

APPENDIX B: PROOF OF THE MAIN THEORETICAL RESULTS

B.1. Proof of Theorem 1. Consider the following simplified log-likelihood function for every p_j as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{c}_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}} \right\},$$

where $\widehat{c}_{ik} = \widehat{\pi}_k (\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma})^{-1} \exp \left\{ - \left(Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta} \right)^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\}$. Recall that $C_n > 0$ is a positive constant such that $C_n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then following the idea of [Fan and Li \(2001\)](#), we know that there must exists a local maximizer \widehat{p}_j in $(p_j - C_n/\sqrt{n}, p_j + C_n/\sqrt{n})$, if we can prove that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left[C_n^{-2} \sup_{\|u\|=1} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j + uC_n/\sqrt{n}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) \right\} < 0 \right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

for any given $\varepsilon > 0$. It can be verified that $-\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)$ is a strictly convex function for p_j . The verification details are given in PART 1 of Appendix C.1. Then, we know that the local maximizer \widehat{p}_j is also the uniquely defined global maximizer as $\widehat{p}_j = \operatorname{argmax}_p \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p)$. Since $C_n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we know that $\|\widehat{p}_j - p_j\| = O_p(C_n/\sqrt{n})$ and therefore \widehat{p}_j is a consistent estimator for p_j .

Unfortunately, the conclusion needs to be proved here is not the statistical consistency of \widehat{p}_j for any given $1 \leq j \leq p$. The desired theorem conclusion is the uniform consistency for \widehat{p}_j over every j . In other words, we wish to prove $\max_j \|\widehat{p}_j - p_j\| = O_p(C_n/\sqrt{n})$. The theorem conclusion follows, if we can show that

$$(B.1) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left[C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \left\{ \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j + uC_n/\sqrt{n}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) \right\} < 0 \right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon,$$

for any given $\varepsilon > 0$. To this end, we apply Taylor's expansion and decompose $\widehat{\Delta}^{(j)} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j + uC_n/\sqrt{n}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = \widehat{W}_a^{(j)} + \widehat{W}_b^{(j)} + \widehat{W}_c^{(j)}$, where $\widehat{W}_a^{(j)} = \{n^{-1/2} \dot{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}^{(j)}(p_j)\}^\top (uC_n)$, $\widehat{W}_b^{(j)} = 2^{-1} (uC_n)^\top \{n^{-1} \ddot{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}^{(j)}(p_j)\} (uC_n)$, $\widehat{W}_c^{(j)} = 2^{-1} (uC_n)^\top n^{-1} \{\dot{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}^{(j)}(\tilde{p}_j) - \dot{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}^{(j)}(p_j)\} (uC_n)$, and $\tilde{p}_j = \alpha_j p_j + (1 - \alpha_j)(p_j + uC_n/\sqrt{n})$ for some $\alpha_j \in (0, 1)$. We then have $C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \widehat{\Delta}^{(j)} \leq C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \widehat{W}_a^{(j)} + C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \widehat{W}_b^{(j)} + C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \widehat{W}_c^{(j)}$.

Define $\nu_{\min} = \tau_{\min}/2 > 0$. Recall that $\log(p)/C_n^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$, $\log(p)/n \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$. Note that $\widehat{\Omega}$ is \sqrt{n} -consistent. Then, it suffices to show that

$$(B.2) \quad P \left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \left| \widehat{W}_a^{(j)} \right| > \varepsilon \right\} \leq 2K \exp \left\{ -C_n^2 (\varepsilon^2 C_1 - \log(p)/C_n^2) \right\} + KP \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\Omega} - \Omega \right\| > \varepsilon C_2 C_n / \sqrt{n} \right\} + \frac{C_3}{n}$$

$$(B.3) \quad P \left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \left(\widehat{W}_b^{(j)} + C_n^2 \nu_{\min} \right) > \varepsilon \right\} \leq 2K^2 \exp \left\{ -n (U_1 \varepsilon^2 - \log(p)/n) \right\} + K^2 P \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\Omega} - \Omega \right\| > U_2 \varepsilon \right\} + \frac{U_3}{n}$$

$$(B.4) \quad P \left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \left| \widehat{W}_c^{(j)} \right| > \varepsilon \right\} \leq 2K^2 P \left\{ \left\| \widehat{\Omega} - \Omega \right\| > 2U_2 \varepsilon / 3 \right\} + \frac{2U_3}{n},$$

for any given $\varepsilon > 0$. Here C_1, C_2, C_3, U_1, U_2 and U_3 are some fixed and positive constants. Those three conclusions are to be proved in the following three steps.

STEP 1. We start with (B.2). Define $W_a^{(j)} = \{n^{-1/2} \dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)\}^\top (uC_n)$ and $\Delta_a^{(j)} = \widehat{W}_a^{(j)} - W_a^{(j)}$. Note that $\widehat{W}_a^{(j)} = W_a^{(j)} + \Delta_a^{(j)}$. Then, we have $P \left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \left| \widehat{W}_a^{(j)} \right| > \varepsilon \right\} \leq \mathcal{D}_{a1}^{(j)} + \mathcal{D}_{a2}^{(j)}$, where $\mathcal{D}_{a1}^{(j)} = P \left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |W_a^{(j)}| > \varepsilon/2 \right\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{a2}^{(j)} = P \left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |\Delta_a^{(j)}| > \varepsilon/2 \right\}$. To prove (B.2), it suffices to upper bound $\mathcal{D}_{a1}^{(j)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{a2}^{(j)}$ separately. The details are given in the following two sub-steps.

STEP 1.1. We start with $\mathcal{D}_{a1}^{(j)}$. Note that $\sup_{\|u\|=1} |W_a^{(j)}| \leq C_n \sqrt{n} \|n^{-1} \dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)\|$. Then, we obtain the following inequality as

$$(B.5) \quad \mathcal{D}_{a1}^{(j)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p P \left\{ \left\| n^{-1} \dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) \right\| > \frac{\varepsilon C_n}{2\sqrt{n}} \right\}.$$

To upper bound the right hand side of (B.5), we shall focus on $n^{-1} \dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Recall that $\dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = (\dot{\ell}_1^{(j)}, \dots, \dot{\ell}_K^{(j)})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $\dot{\ell}_k^{(j)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}$, $\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)} = \alpha_{ik}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj})$, $\alpha_{ik}^{(j)} = c_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}} / \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}}$, and $s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) = Z_{ij}/p_{kj} - (1 - Z_{ij})/(1 - p_{kj})$. Then, we have $\|n^{-1} \dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)\| = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K (n^{-1} \dot{\ell}_k^{(j)})^2 \right\}^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{K} \max_k |n^{-1} \dot{\ell}_k^{(j)}|$. Thus, $P \left\{ \|n^{-1} \dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)\| > \varepsilon C_n / (2\sqrt{n}) \right\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^K P \left\{ \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)} \right| > \varepsilon C_n / (2\sqrt{nK}) \right\}$. One can verify that $|\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}| \leq p_m$, $E(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}) = 0$ and $\text{var}(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}) \leq p_m^2$, where $p_m = p_{\min}^{-1} + (1 - p_{\max})^{-1}$ is a fixed constant. The derivation details are given in PART 2 of Appendix C.1. Thus, we can apply the Bernstein's Inequality (Bernstein, 1926) as

$$P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)} \right| > \frac{\varepsilon C_n}{2\sqrt{nK}} \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left[- \frac{n \left\{ \varepsilon C_n / (2\sqrt{nK}) \right\}^2 / 2}{p_m^2 + p_m \varepsilon C_n / (6\sqrt{nK})} \right].$$

Recall that $C_n/\sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This means that for any given $\eta > 0$, there exists a sufficient large but fixed constant $N_a > 0$, such that $C_n/\sqrt{n} < \eta$ if $n > N_a$. Then by (B.5) and for sufficient large $n > N_a$, we should have

$$(B.6) \quad \mathcal{D}_{a1}^{(j)} \leq 2K \exp \left\{ -C_n^2 (\varepsilon^2 C_1 - \log(p)/C_n^2) \right\},$$

where $C_1 = 1/(8p_m^2 K + 4p_m \varepsilon \eta \sqrt{K}/3) > 0$ is a fixed constant.

STEP 1.2. Next, we study $\mathcal{D}_{a2}^{(j)}$. Recall that $\mathcal{D}_{a2}^{(j)} = P \left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |\Delta_a^{(j)}| > \varepsilon/2 \right\}$. Define $\dot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)} = n^{-1} \widehat{\dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}}(p_j) - n^{-1} \dot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = (\delta_1^{(j)}, \dots, \delta_K^{(j)})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$, where $\delta_k^{(j)} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_k^{(j,i)}$ and $\delta_k^{(j,i)} = \widehat{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) - \alpha_{ik}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj})$. Note that $\sup_{\|u\|=1} |\Delta_a^{(j)}| = \sup_{\|u\|=1} |W_a^{(j)} - W_a^{(j)}| \leq C_n \sqrt{n} \|\dot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)}\|$. Then, we have

$$(B.7) \quad \mathcal{D}_{a2}^{(j)} \leq P \left\{ \max_j \left\| \dot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)} \right\| > \frac{\varepsilon C_n}{2\sqrt{n}} \right\}.$$

To upper bound the right hand side of (B.7), we shall focus on $\dot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Similar to STEP 1.1, we have $\|\dot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)}\| = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K (\delta_k^{(j)})^2 \right\}^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{K} \max_k |\delta_k^{(j)}|$. Thus, $P \left\{ \max_j \|\dot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)}\| > \varepsilon C_n / (2\sqrt{n}) \right\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^K P \left\{ \max_j |\delta_k^{(j)}| > \varepsilon C_n / (2\sqrt{nK}) \right\}$. By the Taylor's expansion about $\delta_k^{(j)}$ for $\widehat{\Omega}$ at $\Omega = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)} - \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)}(\widehat{\Omega}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) \right\}^\top (\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega),$$

where $\dot{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)}(\Omega) = \partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)} / \partial \Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$ and $\tilde{\Omega} = \alpha \Omega + (1 - \alpha) \hat{\Omega}$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. One can verify that $\|\dot{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)}(\tilde{\Omega}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj})\| \leq C_{K,q} M_a(\varepsilon_i)$ with $C_{K,q} = \sqrt{2K+q+1} > 0$ and $M_a(\varepsilon_i) = M_1^a \varepsilon_i^2 + M_2^a |\varepsilon_i| + M_3^a$. Here $M_1^a > 0$, $M_2^a > 0$ and $M_3^a > 0$ are some fixed constants. The verification details are given in PART 3 of Appendix C.1. Then, we have $\left\| \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)}(\tilde{\Omega}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) / n \right\}^\top (\hat{\Omega} - \Omega) \right\| \leq \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n C_{K,q} M_a(\varepsilon_i) / n \right\} \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\|$, which is independent of j . Consequently, we can obtain that

$$(B.8) \quad P \left\{ \max_j \left| \delta_k^{(j)} \right| > \frac{\varepsilon C_n}{2\sqrt{nK}} \right\} \leq P \left[\left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n M_a(\varepsilon_i) \right\} \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\| > \varepsilon C C_n / \sqrt{n} \right],$$

where $C = 1 / (2C_{K,q} \sqrt{K}) > 0$. Recall that $M_a(\varepsilon_i)$ is the independently and identically distributed random variable with finite moments $E\{M_a(\varepsilon_i)\} = C_{M_a} < \infty$ and $\text{var}\{M_a(\varepsilon_i)\} = C_{M_a}^{(v)} < \infty$. The verification details are given in PART 4 of Appendix C.1. Then, by Law of Large Numbers, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n M_a(\varepsilon_i) / n \xrightarrow{p} C_{M_a}$. Thus, the right hand side of (B.8) can be upper bounded by $P\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n M_a(\varepsilon_i) / n > 2C_{M_a} \right\} + P\left\{ \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\| > \varepsilon C C_n / (2\sqrt{n} C_{M_a}) \right\}$. By Chebyshev's Inequality (), we have $P\left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n M_a(\varepsilon_i) / n - C_{M_a} \right| > C_{M_a} \right\} \leq C_{M_a}^{(v)} / (n C_{M_a}^2)$. Then, we have $\mathcal{D}_{a2}^{(j)}$ to be upper bounded by

$$(B.9) \quad \mathcal{D}_{a2}^{(j)} \leq KP \left\{ \|\hat{\Omega} - \Omega\| > \varepsilon C_2 C_n / \sqrt{n} \right\} + C_3 / n,$$

where $C_2 = C / (2C_{M_a}) > 0$ and $C_3 = K C_{M_a}^{(v)} / C_{M_a}^2 > 0$ are some fixed constants. Combining the results of (B.6) and (B.9), the conclusion in (B.2) has been proved.

STEP 2. We next study (B.3). Recall that $\widehat{W}_b^{(j)} = 2^{-1} (u C_n)^\top \{n^{-1} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)\} (u C_n)$. Similarly, we can define $W_b^{(j)} = 2^{-1} (u C_n)^\top \{n^{-1} \check{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)\} (u C_n)$, $W_I^{(j)} = 2^{-1} (u C_n)^\top \{-I(p_j)\} (u C_n)$, $\Delta_{b1}^{(j)} = W_b^{(j)} - W_I^{(j)}$ and $\Delta_{b2}^{(j)} = \widehat{W}_b^{(j)} - W_b^{(j)}$. Then, we have $\widehat{W}_b^{(j)} = W_I^{(j)} + \Delta_{b1}^{(j)} + \Delta_{b2}^{(j)}$. Furthermore, $\max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} (\widehat{W}_b^{(j)} + C_n^2 \nu_{\min}) = \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} (W_I^{(j)} + C_n^2 \nu_{\min}) + \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \Delta_{b1}^{(j)} + \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \Delta_{b2}^{(j)}$. By (C1), we have $\lambda_{\min}\{I(p_j)\} \geq \tau_{\min} > 0$. In other words, $\lambda_{\max}\{-I(p_j)\} \leq -\tau_{\min}$. Note that $\nu_{\min} < \tau_{\min}$. Then, we can obtain that $P\left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} (W_I^{(j)} + C_n^2 \nu_{\min}) > \varepsilon \right\} = 0$. Thus, $P\left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} (\widehat{W}_b^{(j)} + C_n^2 \nu_{\min}) > \varepsilon \right\} \leq \mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)} + \mathcal{D}_{b2}^{(j)}$, where $\mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)} = P\left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \Delta_{b1}^{(j)} > \varepsilon / 2 \right\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{b2}^{(j)} = P\left\{ C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \Delta_{b2}^{(j)} > \varepsilon / 2 \right\}$. To prove (B.3), it suffices to upper bound $\mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{b2}^{(j)}$ separately. The details are given in the following two sub-steps.

STEP 2.1. We start with $\mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)}$. Recall that $\check{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = (\check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, $\check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)} = -\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})$, $I(p_j) = (\mathcal{E}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, $\mathcal{E}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n E(c_{ik_1} c_{ik_2} / M_{ij})$, and $M_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} p_{kj} \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} (1 - p_{kj})$. Define $\Delta_{bE}^{(j)} = (\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, where $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1)} = n^{-1} \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)} - (-\mathcal{E}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)}) = -n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j}) - E(c_{ik_1} c_{ik_2} / M_{ij}) \right\}$. Equivalently, $\Delta_{bE}^{(j)} = n^{-1} \check{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) - \{-I(p_j)\}$. Then, we have $\sup_{\|u\|=1} \Delta_{b1}^{(j)} \leq$

$\sup_{\|u\|=1} |\Delta_{b1}^{(j)}| \leq 2^{-1} C_n^2 \|\Delta_{bE}^{(j)}\|$. Thus, we obtain the following inequality as $\mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p P\left\{\|\Delta_{bE}^{(j)}\| > \varepsilon\right\}$. Note that $\Delta_{bE}^{(j)}$ is a symmetric matrix. Thus, by the proof of Lemma 1 in Wang (2009), we have $\lambda_{\max}(\Delta_{bE}^{(j)}) \leq K \max_{k_1, k_2} |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1)}|$. Then, $\mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)}$ can be further upper bounded by

$$(B.10) \quad \mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p P\left\{K \max_{k_1, k_2} |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1)}| > \varepsilon\right\} \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k_1, k_2} P\left\{|\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1)}| > \varepsilon/K\right\}.$$

Recall that $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1)} = -n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1, i)}$, where $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1, i)} = \alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j}) - E(c_{ik_1} c_{ik_2} / M_{ij})$. Then, the right hand side of (B.10) can be bounded by $K^2 \sum_{j=1}^p P\left\{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1, i)}| > \varepsilon/K\right\}$. It can be verified that $|\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1, i)}| \leq p_m^2$, $E(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1, i)}) = 0$ and $\text{var}(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1, i)}) \leq p_v$, where $p_v = p_{\min}^{-3} + (1 - p_{\min})^{-3} + p_{\max}^{-3} + (1 - p_{\max})^{-3}$ is a fixed and positive constant. The verification details are given in PART 5 of Appendix C.1. Therefore, the Bernstein's Inequality can be applied. Similar to STEP 1.1, we can obtain the following upper bound of $\mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)}$ as

$$(B.11) \quad \mathcal{D}_{b1}^{(j)} \leq K^2 \sum_{j=1}^p P\left\{\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_1, i)}\right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{K}\right\} \leq 2K^2 \exp\left\{-n(U_1 \varepsilon^2 - \log(p)/n)\right\},$$

where $U_1 = 1/(p_v K^2 + p_m^2 \varepsilon/K) > 0$ is a fixed constant.

STEP 2.2. Next, we study $\mathcal{D}_{b2}^{(j)}$. Recall that $\mathcal{D}_{b2}^{(j)} = P\left\{C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \Delta_{b2}^{(j)} > \varepsilon/2\right\}$. Define $\check{\mathcal{L}}_{\Delta}^{(j)} = n^{-1} \widehat{\check{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}}(p_j) - n^{-1} \check{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = (\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_2)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, where $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_2)} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_2, i)}$ and $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_2, i)} = \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)} - \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)}$ with $\check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)} = -\alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})$ and $\check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)} = -\alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})$. Note that $\sup_{\|u\|=1} \Delta_{b2}^{(j)} \leq \sup_{\|u\|=1} |\Delta_{b2}^{(j)}| = \sup_{\|u\|=1} |W_b^{(j)} - W_b^{(j)}| \leq 2^{-1} C_n^2 \|\check{\mathcal{L}}_{\Delta}^{(j)}\|$. Then, we have $\mathcal{D}_{b2}^{(j)} \leq P\left\{\max_j \|\check{\mathcal{L}}_{\Delta}^{(j)}\| > \varepsilon\right\}$. Note that $\check{\mathcal{L}}_{\Delta}^{(j)}$ is also a symmetric matrix. Similar to STEP 2.1, we have $\lambda_{\max}(\check{\mathcal{L}}_{\Delta}^{(j)}) \leq K \max_{k_1, k_2} |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_2)}|$. Thus, $P\left\{\max_j \|\check{\mathcal{L}}_{\Delta}^{(j)}\| > \varepsilon\right\} \leq \sum_{k_1, k_2} P\left\{\max_j |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_2)}| > \varepsilon/K\right\}$. Similar to STEP 1.2, we conduct the Taylor's expansion about $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_2)}$ for $\widehat{\Omega}$ at Ω as

$$(B.12) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\check{\ell}}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)} = \left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)}(\tilde{\Omega})\right\}^{\top} (\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega),$$

where $\check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)}(\Omega) = \partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)} / \partial \Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$ and $\tilde{\Omega} = \alpha \Omega + (1 - \alpha) \widehat{\Omega}$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. One can also verify that $\|\check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)}(\tilde{\Omega})\| \leq C_{K, q} M_b(\varepsilon_i)$ with $M_b(\varepsilon_i) = M_1^b \varepsilon_i^2 + M_2^b |\varepsilon_i| + M_3^b$. Here $M_1^b > 0$, $M_2^b > 0$ and $M_3^b > 0$ are some fixed constants. The verification details are given in PART 6 of Appendix C.1. Then, we have $\left\|\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, i)}(\tilde{\Omega})/n\right\}^{\top} (\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega)\right\| \leq \left\{\sum_{i=1}^n C_{K, q} M_b(\varepsilon_i)/n\right\} \|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|$, which is also independent of j . Consequently, we can obtain that

$$(B.13) \quad P\left\{\max_j |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j, b_2)}| > \varepsilon/K\right\} \leq P\left[\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n M_b(\varepsilon_i)\right\} \|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\| > \varepsilon/K\right],$$

Similar to STEP 1.2, we have $E\{M_b(\varepsilon_i)\} = C_{M_b} < \infty$ and $\text{var}\{M_b(\varepsilon_i)\} = C_{M_b}^{(v)} < \infty$. The verification details are given in PART 7 of Appendix C.1. Then, by Law of Large Numbers, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n M_b(\varepsilon_i)/n \xrightarrow{P} C_{M_b}$. Thus, the right hand side of (B.13) can be upper bounded by $P\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n M_b(\varepsilon_i)/n > 2C_{M_b}\right\} + P\left\{\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\| > \varepsilon/(KC_{M_b})\right\}$. By Chebyshev's Inequality, we have $P\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^n M_b(\varepsilon_i)/n - C_{M_b}\right| > C_{M_b}\right\} \leq C_{M_b}^{(v)}/(nC_{M_b}^2)$. Then, we have $\mathcal{D}_{b2}^{(j)}$ to be upper bounded by

$$(B.14) \quad \mathcal{D}_{b2}^{(j)} \leq K^2 P\left\{\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\| > U_2\varepsilon\right\} + U_3/n,$$

where $U_2 = 1/(KC_{M_b}) > 0$ and $U_3 = K^2 C_{M_b}^{(v)}/C_{M_b}^2 > 0$ are some fixed constants. Combining the results of (B.11) and (B.14), the conclusion in (B.3) has been proved.

STEP 3. Finally, we shall prove (B.4). Recall that $\widehat{W}_c^{(j)} = 2^{-1}(uC_n)^\top n^{-1}\{\widehat{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}}(\tilde{p}_j) - \widehat{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}}(p_j)\}(uC_n)$. Similar to STEP 1. and STEP 2, define $W_c^{(j)} = 2^{-1}(uC_n)^\top n^{-1}\{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(\tilde{p}_j) - \ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)\}(uC_n)$, $\Delta_{c1}^{(j)} = 2^{-1}(uC_n)^\top n^{-1}\{\widehat{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}}(\tilde{p}_j) - \ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(\tilde{p}_j)\}(uC_n)$ and $\Delta_{c2}^{(j)} = 2^{-1}(uC_n)^\top n^{-1}\{\widehat{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}}(p_j) - \ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)\}(uC_n)$. Then, we can derive that $\widehat{W}_c^{(j)} = W_c^{(j)} + \Delta_{c1}^{(j)} + \Delta_{c2}^{(j)}$. Thus, we have $P\left\{C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |\widehat{W}_c^{(j)}| > \varepsilon\right\} \leq \mathcal{D}_{c1}^{(j)} + \mathcal{D}_{c2}^{(j)} + \mathcal{D}_{c3}^{(j)}$, where $\mathcal{D}_{c1}^{(j)} = P\left\{C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |\Delta_{c1}^{(j)}| > \varepsilon/3\right\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{c2}^{(j)} = P\left\{C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |\Delta_{c2}^{(j)}| > \varepsilon/3\right\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{c3}^{(j)} = P\left\{C_n^{-2} \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |W_c^{(j)}| > \varepsilon/3\right\}$. We have argued the upper bound of $\mathcal{D}_{c2}^{(j)}$ in STEP 2.2. Note that $\mathcal{D}_{c1}^{(j)}$ is the same as $\mathcal{D}_{c2}^{(j)}$ but for the parameter \tilde{p}_j . Thus, we can obtain the following common upper bound for $\mathcal{D}_{c1}^{(j)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{c2}^{(j)}$ as

$$(B.15) \quad K^2 P\left\{\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\| > 2U_2\varepsilon/3\right\} + U_3/n.$$

Next, we focus on $\mathcal{D}_{c3}^{(j)}$.

To upper bound $\mathcal{D}_{c3}^{(j)}$, we define $\widetilde{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)}} = n^{-1}\widehat{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}}(\tilde{p}_j) - n^{-1}\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = (\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,c)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, where $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,c)} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,c,i)}$, $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,c,i)} = \widetilde{\ddot{\ell}}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} - \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}$, $\widetilde{\ddot{\ell}}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} = -\widetilde{\alpha}_{ik_1}^{(j)} \widetilde{\alpha}_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, \tilde{p}_{k_1 j}) s(Z_{ij}, \tilde{p}_{k_2 j})$, $\widetilde{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)} = c_{ik} \tilde{p}_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - \tilde{p}_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}} / \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} \tilde{p}_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - \tilde{p}_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}}$, and $s(Z_{ij}, \tilde{p}_{kj}) = Z_{ij}/\tilde{p}_{kj} - (1 - Z_{ij})/(1 - \tilde{p}_{kj})$. Then, we have $\mathcal{D}_{c3}^{(j)} \leq P\left\{\max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \|\widetilde{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)}}\| > 2\varepsilon/3\right\}$. Similar to STEP 2.1, we have $\lambda_{\max}(\widetilde{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)}}) \leq K \max_{k_1, k_2} |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,c)}|$. Thus, $P\left\{\max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} \|\widetilde{\ddot{\mathcal{L}}_\Delta^{(j)}}\| > 2\varepsilon/3\right\} \leq \sum_{k_1, k_2} P\left\{\max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,c)}| > 2\varepsilon/(3K)\right\}$. Similar to STEP 1.2, we conduct the Taylor's expansion about $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,c)}$ for \tilde{p}_j at p_j as

$$(B.16) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{\ddot{\ell}}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(\tilde{p}_j) \right\}^\top (\tilde{p}_j - p_j),$$

where $\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(p_j) = \partial \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} / \partial p_j \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and $\tilde{p}_j = \beta p_j + (1 - \beta)\tilde{p}_j$ for some $\beta \in (0, 1)$. One can verify that $\|\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(\tilde{p}_j)\| \leq p_m^3 \sqrt{K}$. The verification details are given in PART 8 of

Appendix C.1. Then, we have $\left\| \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(\tilde{p}_j)/n \right\}^\top (\tilde{p}_j - p_j) \right\| \leq p_m^3 \sqrt{K} \|\tilde{p}_j - p_j\|$. Recall that $\tilde{p}_j = \alpha_j p_j + (1 - \alpha_j)(p_j + u C_n / \sqrt{n})$ for some $\alpha_j \in (0, 1)$. Immediately, we have $\sup_{\|u\|=1} \|\tilde{p}_j - p_j\| \leq C_n \sqrt{K/n}$. Thus, we can obtain that $P \left\{ \max_j \sup_{\|u\|=1} |\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,c)}| > 2\varepsilon / (3K) \right\} \leq P \left\{ K p_m^3 C_n / \sqrt{n} > 2\varepsilon / (3K) \right\}$. We have $P \left\{ K p_m^3 C_n / \sqrt{n} > 2\varepsilon / (3K) \right\} = 0$ as long as $n > \left\{ 3K^2 p_m^3 C_n / (2\varepsilon) \right\}^2$. Thus, we can obtain that $\mathcal{D}_{c3}^{(j)} = 0$. Combining the results of (B.15), the conclusion in (B.4) has been proved. As a result, we completes the theorem proof.

B.2. Proof of Theorem 2. Write $\varepsilon_\nu^p = \exp(-\nu p)$. We then have $P \left\{ \max_{i,k} |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)| > \varepsilon_\nu^p \right\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^K P \left\{ \max_i |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)| > \varepsilon_\nu^p \right\} = \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \pi_k \widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a + (1 - \pi_k) \widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b \right\}$, where $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a = P \left\{ \max_i |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - 1| > \varepsilon_\nu^p \mid \mathcal{K}_i = k \right\}$ and $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b = P \left\{ \max_i |\widehat{\pi}_{ik}| > \varepsilon_\nu^p \mid \mathcal{K}_i \neq k \right\}$. Note that K is a fixed integer. Therefore, it suffices to upper bound $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a$ and $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b$ separately.

STEP 1. We first focus on $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a$. Define $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} = \prod_{j=1}^p r_{ij}^{(m,k)}$, where $r_{ij}^{(m,k)} = (\widehat{p}_{mj} / \widehat{p}_{kj})^{Z_{ij}} \left\{ (1 - \widehat{p}_{mj}) / (1 - \widehat{p}_{kj}) \right\}^{1 - Z_{ij}}$. To study $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a$, it is important to understand the asymptotic behavior of $|\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - 1|$, which is given by $|\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - 1| = \left(\sum_{m \neq k} \widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} \right) / \left(1 + \sum_{m \neq k} \widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} \right) \leq \sum_{m \neq k} \widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)}$. Here $\widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} = \left[\widehat{\pi}_m \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_m - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\} \right] / \left[\widehat{\pi}_k \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\} \right]$. Thus, we can obtain

$$(B.17) \quad \widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a = P \left\{ \max_i |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - 1| > \varepsilon_\nu^p \mid \mathcal{K}_i = k \right\} \leq \sum_{m \neq k} P \left\{ \max_i \widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} > \varepsilon_\nu^p / K \right\}.$$

To upper bound $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a$, it suffices to upper bound $P^{(m,k)} = P \left\{ \max_i \widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} > \varepsilon_\nu^p / K \right\}$. Recall that $\varepsilon_\nu^p = \exp(-\nu p)$. Direct computation leads to $P^{(m,k)} = P \left\{ \max_i p^{-1} \log \left(\widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} \right) > -\nu - (\log K) / p \right\}$. It can be verified that $P^{(m,k)} \leq P \left\{ \max_i p^{-1} \log \left(\widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} \right) > -2\nu \right\}$ as long as $p > (\log K) / \nu$. Similarly, we can define $\mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)} = \prod_{j=1}^p r_{ij}^{(m,k)}$, where $r_{ij}^{(m,k)} = (p_{mj} / p_{kj})^{Z_{ij}} \left\{ (1 - p_{mj}) / (1 - p_{kj}) \right\}^{1 - Z_{ij}}$. Let $\mathcal{R}_{i\Delta}^{(m,k)} = p^{-1} \log \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} - p^{-1} \log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)}$. Note that $\max_i p^{-1} \log \left(\widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} \right) \leq \max_i p^{-1} \log \widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} + \max_i \mathcal{R}_{i\Delta}^{(m,k)} + \max_i p^{-1} \log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)}$. Thus, we have $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a = o(1)$ if we can show that

$$(B.18) \quad \max_i \left| p^{-1} \log \widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \right| = o_p(1),$$

$$(B.19) \quad \max_i \left| \mathcal{R}_{i\Delta}^{(m,k)} \right| = o_p(1),$$

$$(B.20) \quad P \left\{ \max_i p^{-1} \log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)} + 2\nu > \varepsilon \right\} \leq \exp \left(-C_1 p / C_2 \right),$$

for any given $\varepsilon > 0$. Here $C_1 = (\varepsilon - 2\nu + \Delta_{\min})^2/2 > 0$ and $C_2 = C_\sigma + b^2 > 0$ are some fixed and positive constants. Those three conclusions are to be proved separately in the following three substeps.

STEP 1.1. We start with (B.18). Recall that $\widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} = \left[\widehat{\pi}_m \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_m - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\} \right] / \left[\widehat{\pi}_k \exp \left\{ - (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\} \right] \leq \left(\widehat{\pi}_m / \widehat{\pi}_k \right) \exp \left\{ (Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\}$. With $\mathcal{K}_i = k$, we have $Y_i = \gamma_k + X_i^\top \theta + \varepsilon_i$, where ε_i follows a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (), we can obtain that $(Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 = \left\{ \gamma_k - \widehat{\gamma}_k + X_i^\top (\theta - \widehat{\theta}) + \varepsilon_i \right\}^2 \leq 3(\gamma_k - \widehat{\gamma}_k)^2 + 3 \left\{ X_i^\top (\theta - \widehat{\theta}) \right\}^2 + 3\varepsilon_i^2$. Direct computation leads to $p^{-1} |\log \widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)}| \leq p^{-1} |\log (\widehat{\pi}_m / \widehat{\pi}_k)| + p^{-1} |(Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2)| \leq \mathcal{C}_1^{(m,k)} + \mathcal{C}_2^{(m,k)} + \mathcal{C}_3^{(m,k)} + \mathcal{C}_4^{(m,k)}$, where $\mathcal{C}_1^{(m,k)} = p^{-1} \max_i |\log (\widehat{\pi}_m / \widehat{\pi}_k)|$, $\mathcal{C}_2^{(m,k)} = 3p^{-1} \max_i (\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_k)^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2)$, $\mathcal{C}_3^{(m,k)} = 3p^{-1} \max_i \left\{ X_i^\top (\widehat{\theta} - \theta) \right\}^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2)$, and $\mathcal{C}_4^{(m,k)} = 3p^{-1} \max_i \varepsilon_i^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2)$. Note that these constants $\mathcal{C}_t^{(m,k)}$ with $1 \leq t \leq 4$ are independent of the subscript i . Next, it can be verified that $\mathcal{C}_1^{(m,k)} = O_p(1/p)$, $\mathcal{C}_2^{(m,k)} = O_p(1/(pn))$, $\mathcal{C}_3^{(m,k)} = O_p(1/(pn))$, and $\mathcal{C}_4^{(m,k)} = O_p(\log n/p)$. The verification details are given in STEPS 1.1.1—1.1.4 of Appendix C.2. Combining the above results, (B.18) is proved.

STEP 1.2. Next, we prove (B.19). Recall that $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{i\Delta}^{(m,k)} = p^{-1} \log \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} - p^{-1} \log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} = \prod_{j=1}^p \widehat{r}_{ij}^{(m,k)}$, and $\widehat{r}_{ij}^{(m,k)} = (\widehat{p}_{mj} / \widehat{p}_{kj})^{Z_{ij}} \left\{ (1 - \widehat{p}_{mj}) / (1 - \widehat{p}_{kj}) \right\}^{1 - Z_{ij}}$. $\mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)}$ and $r_{ij}^{(m,k)}$ are in the same form. Direct computation leads to $\log \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)} = \sum_{j=1}^p \widehat{V}_{ij}^{(m,k)}$, where $\widehat{V}_{ij}^{(m,k)} = \log \widehat{r}_{ij}^{(m,k)} = Z_{ij} \log (\widehat{p}_{mj} / \widehat{p}_{kj}) + (1 - Z_{ij}) \log \left\{ (1 - \widehat{p}_{mj}) / (1 - \widehat{p}_{kj}) \right\}$. Similarly, $\log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)} = \sum_{j=1}^p V_{ij}^{(m,k)}$, where $V_{ij}^{(m,k)} = \log r_{ij}^{(m,k)} = Z_{ij} \log (p_{mj} / p_{kj}) + (1 - Z_{ij}) \log \left\{ (1 - p_{mj}) / (1 - p_{kj}) \right\}$. Thus, $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{i\Delta}^{(m,k)} = \sum_{j=1}^p (\widehat{V}_{ij}^{(m,k)} - V_{ij}^{(m,k)}) / p$. One can verified that $|\widehat{V}_{ij}^{(m,k)} - V_{ij}^{(m,k)}| \leq 2p_m |\widehat{p}_{mj} - p_{mj}| + 2p_m |\widehat{p}_{kj} - p_{kj}|$, where $p_m = p_{\min}^{-1} + (1 - p_{\max})^{-1}$. The verification details are given in STEP 1.2.1 of Appendix C.2. Thus, we can obtain that $|\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{i\Delta}^{(m,k)}| \leq \max_j |\widehat{V}_{ij}^{(m,k)} - V_{ij}^{(m,k)}| \leq 2p_m \max_j |\widehat{p}_{mj} - p_{mj}| + 2p_m \max_j |\widehat{p}_{kj} - p_{kj}|$. Note that this is an upper bound uniformly over $1 \leq i \leq n$. In the meanwhile by Theorem 1, we have $\max_j |\widehat{p}_{kj} - p_{kj}| = O_p(C_n / \sqrt{n})$. As a result, $\max_i |\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{i\Delta}^{(m,k)}| \leq O_p(C_n / \sqrt{n})$. This completes the proof of (B.19).

STEP 1.3. To prove (B.20), we shall focus on $\log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)}$. Following the definition in STEP 1.2, we have $\log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)} = \sum_{j=1}^p V_{ij}^{(m,k)}$, where $V_{ij}^{(m,k)} = \log r_{ij}^{(m,k)} = Z_{ij} \log (p_{mj} / p_{kj}) + (1 - Z_{ij}) \log \left\{ (1 - p_{mj}) / (1 - p_{kj}) \right\}$. Note that $V_{ij}^{(m,k)}$ is a uniformly bounded random variable with $|V_{ij}^{(m,k)}| \leq b$ with the upper bound $b = \max \left\{ \log (p_{\max} / p_{\min}), \log \left\{ (1 - p_{\min}) / (1 - p_{\max}) \right\} \right\}$. Thus, the Bernstein's Inequality (Bernstein, 1926) can be readily applied as

$$(B.21) \quad P \left[\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \left\{ V_{ij}^{(m,k)} - E \left(V_{ij}^{(m,k)} \right) \right\} > \varepsilon_{(\nu, E)}^p \right] \leq \exp \left(- \mathcal{D}_a / \mathcal{D}_b \right),$$

where $\mathcal{D}_a = p(\varepsilon_{(\nu,E)}^p)^2/2$, $\mathcal{D}_b = \sum_{j=1}^p \text{var}(V_j^{(m,k)})/p + b\varepsilon_{(\nu,E)}^p/3$, and $\varepsilon_{(\nu,E)}^p = \varepsilon - 2\nu - \sum_{j=1}^p E(V_j^{(m,k)})/p > \varepsilon - 2\nu + \Delta_{\min} > 0$. To further bound the right-hand side of (B.21), we need to lower bound \mathcal{D}_a and upper bound \mathcal{D}_b separately. One can verify that $\mathcal{D}_a \geq C_1 p$ and $\mathcal{D}_b \leq C_2$, where $C_1 = (\varepsilon - 2\nu + \Delta_{\min})^2/2 > 0$ and $C_2 = C_\sigma + b^2 > 0$ are some fixed constants. The verification details are given in STEPS 1.3.1–1.3.2 of Appendix C.2. Thus, we can obtain that $P\left\{\max_i p^{-1} \log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)} + 2\nu > \varepsilon\right\} \leq \exp(-C_1 p/C_2)$. Consequently, we have (B.20) rigorously proved.

Combining the results from (B.18), (B.19) and (B.20), we can obtain that $P^{(m,k)} \leq P\left\{\max_i p^{-1} \log \left(\widehat{c}_i^{(m,k)} \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_i^{(m,k)}\right) > -2\nu\right\} \leq P\left\{o_p(1) + \max_i p^{-1} \log \mathcal{R}_i^{(m,k)} > -2\nu\right\} = o(1)$. Since K is a fixed integer, we then have $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a = \sum_{m \neq k} P^{(m,k)} = o(1)$. This completes the proof of STEP 1.

STEP 2. Next, we study $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b = P\left\{\max_i |\widehat{\pi}_{ik}| > \varepsilon_\nu^p | \mathcal{K}_i \neq k\right\}$. Note that $\sum_{k=1}^K I(\mathcal{K}_i = k) = 1$ with $I(\mathcal{K}_i = k) \in \{0, 1\}$. Thus, there should exist only a $k' \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, such that $I(\mathcal{K}_i = k') = 1$ and $I(\mathcal{K}_i = k) = 0$ for every $k \neq k'$. Then we have $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b = \sum_{k' \neq k} \widehat{P}_\nu^{(k',k)}$, where $\widehat{P}_\nu^{(k',k)} = P\left(\max_i |\widehat{\pi}_{ik}| > \varepsilon_\nu^p | \mathcal{K}_i = k'\right) P(\mathcal{K}_i = k') / P(\mathcal{K}_i \neq k)$. Recall that $\sum_{s=1}^K \widehat{\pi}_{is} = 1$ with $0 < \widehat{\pi}_{is} < 1$. Direct computation leads to $|\widehat{\pi}_{ik'} - 1| = \sum_{s \neq k'} \widehat{\pi}_{is} \geq \widehat{\pi}_{ik}$. Then, we have $\widehat{P}_\nu^{(k',k)} \leq P\left(\max_i |\widehat{\pi}_{ik'} - 1| > \varepsilon_\nu^p | \mathcal{K}_i = k'\right)$. By the results of $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a$, we can obtain $\widehat{P}_\nu^{(k',k)} = o(1)$ as long as $p > (\log K)/\nu$. Note that K is a fixed integer. Thus, we have $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b = \sum_{k' \neq k} \widehat{P}_\nu^{(k',k)} = o(1)$ for any $p > (\log K)/\nu$. This completes the discussion of $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b$.

Combining the results of $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a$ and $\widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b$ from the STEP 1 & 2, we can obtain that $P\left\{\max_{i,k} |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - I(\mathcal{K}_i = k)| > \varepsilon_\nu^p\right\} = \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{\pi_k \widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^a + (1 - \pi_k) \widehat{Q}_{(\nu,k)}^b\right\} = o(1)$. This proves the theorem conclusion and completes the whole theorem proof.

B.3. Proof of Theorem 3. Recall that $\Omega = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma^2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$ and $\Phi = (\gamma^\top, \theta^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K+q}$, we then have $\|\widehat{\Omega}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}\| \leq \|\widehat{\pi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\pi}_{\text{oracle}}\| + \|\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\| + |\widehat{\sigma}_{\text{real}}^2 - \widehat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2|$. Therefore, the theorem conclusion follows, if we can show that $\|\widehat{\pi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\pi}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$, $\|\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ and $|\widehat{\sigma}_{\text{real}}^2 - \widehat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Those three conclusions are to be proved separately in the following three steps.

STEP 1. We start with $\|\widehat{\pi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\pi}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Recall that $\widehat{\pi} = (\widehat{\pi}_1, \dots, \widehat{\pi}_K)$, $\widehat{\pi}_{\text{real},k} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\pi}_{ik}\right)/n$ and $\widehat{\pi}_{\text{oracle},k} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_{ik}\right)/n$. Then, we have $\|\widehat{\pi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\pi}_{\text{oracle}}\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}|/n \leq K \max_{i,k} |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}|$. Therefore, $\|\widehat{\pi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\pi}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ is proved if we can show that $\max_{i,k} |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. We then consider for an arbitrary but fixed constant $\varepsilon > 0$ and the evaluation $P_\varepsilon^* = P\left\{\sqrt{n} \max_{i,k} |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| > \varepsilon\right\}$. By Theorem 2, we know that $P\left\{\max_{i,k} |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| > \exp(-\nu p)\right\} = o(1)$. Thus, we shall compute P_ε^* as

$$(B.1) \quad P_\varepsilon^* = P\left\{\max_{i,k} |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| > \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}\right\} \leq P\left\{\max_{i,k} |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| > \exp(-\nu p)\right\} = o(1),$$

as long as n is sufficiently large. The inequality in (B.1) is mainly because $\sqrt{n} \exp(-\nu p) = \exp\{2^{-1} \log(n) - \nu p\} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by the technical condition (C4). This completes the proof of $\|\hat{\pi}_{\text{real}} - \hat{\pi}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$.

STEP 2. Next, we prove $\|\hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Recall that $\hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} = \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xy}}$ and $\hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}} = \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xy}}$, where $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\pi X_i^{\pi\top}$, $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xy}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\pi Y_i$, $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^a X_i^{a\top}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xy}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^a Y_i$. We then have $\|\hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\| \leq \left\| \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}}\right)^{-1} - \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}}\right)^{-1} \right\| \cdot \|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xy}}\| + \left\| \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}}\right)^{-1} \right\| \cdot \|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xy}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xy}}\|$. Note that $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^a X_i^{a\top} \xrightarrow{p} E\left(X_i^a X_i^{a\top}\right)$, which is a positive definite matrix. Therefore, the theorem conclusion follows, if we can show that $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}} \right\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ and $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xy}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xy}} \right\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Since the proof is nearly identical, we shall present the proof details for $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}} \right\|$ only.

By definition, we have $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}} \right\| = \left\| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^\pi X_i^{\pi\top} - X_i^a X_i^{a\top}) \right\| \leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\Delta_{\text{xx}}^i\|$, where $\Delta_{\text{xx}}^i = X_i^\pi X_i^{\pi\top} - X_i^a X_i^{a\top}$. Write $\Delta_{\text{xx}}^i = (\delta_{j_1 j_2}^i) \in \mathbb{R}^{(K+q) \times (K+q)}$. Note that Δ_{xx}^i is a symmetric matrix. Thus, by the proof of Lemma 1 in Wang (2009), we have $\|\Delta_{\text{xx}}^i\| = \lambda_{\max}(\Delta_{\text{xx}}^i) \leq (K+q) \max_{j_1, j_2} |\delta_{j_1 j_2}^i|$. It can be verified that $\max_{j_1, j_2} |\delta_{j_1 j_2}^i| \leq \max_k |\hat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| (2 + \|X_i\|)$. The verification details are given in Appendix C.3. Thus, we can obtain that $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\Delta_{\text{xx}}^i\| \leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (K+q) \max_k |\hat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| (2 + \|X_i\|) \leq (K+q) \left\{ \max_{i,k} |\hat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| \right\} \sum_{i=1}^n (2 + \|X_i\|)/n$. By the previous step, we have $\max_{i,k} |\hat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Therefore, $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xx}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xx}} \right\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ is proved. Similarly, we can prove that $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{real}}^{\text{xy}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^{\text{xy}} \right\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Thus, this completes the proof of STEP 2.

STEP 3. Finally, we prove $|\hat{\sigma}_{\text{real}}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Recall that $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{real}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^{\pi\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2/n$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^{a\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}})^2/n$. Then, we have $|\hat{\sigma}_{\text{real}}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2| \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^{\pi\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2/n - \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^{a\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}})^2/n \right| \leq \mathcal{Q}_1 + \mathcal{Q}_2$, where $\mathcal{Q}_1 = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (Y_i - X_i^{\pi\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2 - (Y_i - X_i^{a\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2 \right\} /n \right|$ and $\mathcal{Q}_2 = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (Y_i - X_i^{a\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2 - (Y_i - X_i^{a\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}})^2 \right\} /n \right|$. Therefore, it suffices to study \mathcal{Q}_1 and \mathcal{Q}_2 separately.

STEP 3.1. We start with \mathcal{Q}_1 . Direct computation leads to $\mathcal{Q}_1 = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (X_i^{\pi\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2 - (X_i^{a\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2 - 2Y_i (X_i^\pi - X_i^a)^\top \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} \right\} /n \right| \leq \mathcal{Q}_1^a + \mathcal{Q}_1^b$, where $\mathcal{Q}_1^a = \sum_{i=1}^n \left| (X_i^{\pi\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2 - (X_i^{a\top} \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}})^2 \right|/n$ and $\mathcal{Q}_1^b = 2K \|\hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}}\| \left\{ \max_{i,k} |\hat{\pi}_{i,k} - a_{i,k}| \right\} \sum_{i=1}^n |Y_i|/n$. Further, we have $\mathcal{Q}_1^a = \sum_{i=1}^n \left| (X_i^\pi - X_i^a)^\top \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} \right| \cdot \left| (X_i^\pi + X_i^a)^\top \hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} \right|/n \leq 2K \|\hat{\Phi}_{\text{real}}\|^2 \left\{ \max_{i,k} |\hat{\pi}_{i,k} - a_{i,k}| \right\} \sum_{i=1}^n (\|X_i\| + K)/n$. Note that both \mathcal{Q}_1^a and \mathcal{Q}_1^b are determined by $\max_{i,k} |\hat{\pi}_{i,k} - a_{i,k}|$. By STEP 1, we have $\max_{i,k} |\hat{\pi}_{i,k} - a_{i,k}| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Thus, $\mathcal{Q}_1^a = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_1^b = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{Q}_1 = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$.

STEP 3.2. Next, we study \mathcal{Q}_2 . Direct computation leads to $\mathcal{Q}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \left(X_i^{a\top} \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} \right)^2 - \left(X_i^{a\top} \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}} \right)^2 - 2Y_i X_i^{a\top} \left(\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}} \right) \right\} / n \leq \mathcal{Q}_2^a + \mathcal{Q}_2^b$, where $\mathcal{Q}_2^a = \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \left(X_i^{a\top} \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} \right)^2 - \left(X_i^{a\top} \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}} \right)^2 \right| / n$ and $\mathcal{Q}_2^b = 2 \|\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\| \sum_{i=1}^n (\|X_i\| + 1) |Y_i| / n$. Similar to the previous substep, we have $\mathcal{Q}_2^a = \sum_{i=1}^n \left| X_i^{a\top} \left(\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}} \right) \right| \cdot \left| X_i^{a\top} \left(\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} + \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}} \right) \right| / n \leq \|\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\| \cdot \|\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} + \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\| \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (\|X_i\| + 1)^2 / n$. Note that both \mathcal{Q}_2^a and \mathcal{Q}_2^b are determined by $\|\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\|$. By STEP 2, we have $\|\widehat{\Phi}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Phi}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Thus, $\mathcal{Q}_2^a = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_2^b = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{Q}_2 = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Combining the results of $\mathcal{Q}_1 = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_2 = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$, $|\widehat{\sigma}_{\text{real}}^2 - \widehat{\sigma}_{\text{oracle}}^2| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ is proved. Thus, we have $\|\widehat{\Omega}_{\text{real}} - \widehat{\Omega}_{\text{oracle}}\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

APPENDIX C: VERIFICATION DETAILS

In this appendix, we show in detail the calculation process of some results given in Appendix B.

C.1. Proof of results in Appendix B.1. PART 1. Recall that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{c}_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}} \right\},$$

where $\widehat{c}_{ik} = \widehat{\pi}_k (\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma})^{-1} \exp \left\{ - \left(Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta} \right)^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\}$. Note that \widehat{c}_{ik} is independent of $p_j = (p_{1j}, \dots, p_{2j}) \in \mathbb{R}^K$. To verify that $-\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)$ is a strictly convex function for p_j , it suffices to show that $-\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = -\partial^2 \widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) / \partial p_j \partial p_j^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is semi-positive definite. Recall that $\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = (\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, $\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j)} = -\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})$, $\alpha_{ik}^{(j)} = \widehat{c}_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}} / \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{c}_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}}$, $s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) = Z_{ij} / p_{kj} - (1 - Z_{ij}) / (1 - p_{kj})$, and $\widehat{c}_{ik} = \widehat{\pi}_k (\sqrt{2\pi}\widehat{\sigma})^{-1} \exp \left\{ - \left(Y_i - \widehat{\gamma}_k - X_i^\top \widehat{\theta} \right)^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) \right\}$. Define $\widehat{\alpha}_i^{(j)} = \left(\alpha_{i1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{1j}), \dots, \alpha_{iK}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{Kj}) \right) \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Then, $-\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)$ can be rewritten as $-\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\alpha}_i^{(j)} \left(\widehat{\alpha}_i^{(j)} \right)^\top$. For an arbitrary but non-zero vector X , we have $X^\top \left\{ -\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j) \right\} X = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ X^\top \widehat{\alpha}_i^{(j)} \right\} \left\{ X^\top \widehat{\alpha}_i^{(j)} \right\}^\top \geq 0$. Note that $\widehat{\alpha}_i^{(j)} \left(\widehat{\alpha}_i^{(j)} \right)^\top$ is a matrix of rank one. Then, we can obtain that $-\ddot{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)$ is of full rank. By definition, $-\widehat{\mathcal{L}}^{(j)}(p_j)$ is a strictly convex function for p_j .

PART 2. Recall that $\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)} = \alpha_{ik}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj})$, $\alpha_{ik}^{(j)} = c_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}} / \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}}$, $s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) = Z_{ij} / p_{kj} - (1 - Z_{ij}) / (1 - p_{kj})$, and $c_{ik} = \pi_k (\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^{-1} \exp \left\{ - \left(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta \right)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\}$. Note that $|\alpha_{ik}^{(j)}| \leq 1$ and $Z_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$. By (C2), we then have $|\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}| \leq p_m$, where $p_m = p_{\min}^{-1} + (1 - p_{\max})^{-1}$. Next, we calculate $E(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}) = E \left\{ E(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)} | Y_i, X_i) \right\}$. Direct computation leads to $P(Z_{ij} = 1 | Y_i, X_i) = P(Z_{ij} = 1, Y_i, X_i) / P(Y_i, X_i) = \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} p_{kj} / \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik}$. Then, we have $E(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)} | Y_i, X_i) =$

$\{c_{ik}/\sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik}p_{kj}\}\{\sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik}p_{kj}/\sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik}\} - \{c_{ik}/\sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik}(1-p_{kj})\}\{1-\sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik}p_{kj}/\sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik}\} = 0$. Thus, $E(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}) = 0$. Next, we calculate $\text{var}(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)})$. Direct computation leads to $\text{var}(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}) = E(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)})^2$. Recall that $|\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}| \leq p_m$. Thus, we can immediately obtain that $\text{var}(\dot{\ell}_k^{(j,i)}) \leq p_m^2$. This completes PART 2.

PART 3. We need to study $\|\dot{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)}(\tilde{\Omega})s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj})\|$. We can rewrite $\alpha_{ik}^{(j)}s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) = \beta_{ik}^{(j)}s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj})/\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)}$, where $\beta_{ik}^{(j)} = c_{ik}p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}}(1-p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}}$. Then, we need to calculate $\dot{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)}(\Omega)$, which is the first-order partial derivative about $\alpha_{ik}^{(j)}$ with respect to $\Omega = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$. We start with $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Direct computation leads to

$$\left| \frac{\partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}}{\partial \pi_k} \right| = \left| \frac{\beta_{ik}^{(j)}}{\pi_k \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)}} - \frac{(\beta_{ik}^{(j)})^2}{\pi_k (\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)})^2} \right| \leq \frac{2}{\pi_{\min}}.$$

Similarly, we have $|\partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}/\partial \pi_m| \leq \pi_{\min}^{-1}$ for every $m \neq k$. Next, we study $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$. By the assumption assumptions, we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}}{\partial \gamma_k} \right| = \left| \left\{ \frac{\beta_{ik}^{(j)}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)}} - \frac{(\beta_{ik}^{(j)})^2}{(\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)})^2} \right\} \frac{(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)}{\sigma^2} \right| \leq \frac{2}{\sigma^2} (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|).$$

Similarly, we have $|\partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}/\partial \gamma_m| \leq (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|)/\sigma^2$ for every $m \neq k$. We next focus on $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Direct computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}}{\partial \theta} \right\| &= \left\| \left\{ \frac{\beta_{ik}^{(j)}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)}} (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta) X_i / \sigma^2 \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left\{ \frac{\beta_{ik}^{(j)}}{(\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)})^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)} (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta) X_i / \sigma^2 \right\} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have $\|\partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}/\partial \theta\| \leq (K+1)(2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|)\|X_i\|/\sigma^2$. Finally, we take partial derivative about $\alpha_{ik}^{(j)}$ with respect to σ as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}}{\partial \sigma} \right| &= \left| \left\{ \frac{\beta_{ik}^{(j)}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)}} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2 - 1 \right) / \sigma \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left\{ \frac{\beta_{ik}^{(j)}}{(\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)})^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2 - 1 \right) / \sigma \right\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $|\partial \alpha_{ik}^{(j)}/\partial \sigma| \leq (K+1)(2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|)^2/\sigma_{\min}^3 + (K+1)/\sigma$. Combining the above results, we can obtain that $\|\dot{\alpha}_{ik}^{(j)}(\Omega)s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj})\| \leq C_{K,q}M_a(\varepsilon_i)$, where $C_{K,q} = \sqrt{2K+q+1} > 0$ and $M_a(\varepsilon_i) = p_m(K+1)(2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|)^2/\sigma^3 + p_m(K+1)(2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|)\|X_i\|/\sigma^2 + 2p_m(2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|)/\sigma^2 + p_m(K+1)/\sigma + 2p_m/\pi_{\min}$. $M_a(\varepsilon_i)$ can be formulated as $M_a(\varepsilon_i) = M_1^a \varepsilon_i^2 + M_2^a |\varepsilon_i| + M_3^a$, where $M_1^a > 0$, $M_2^a > 0$ and $M_3^a > 0$ are some fixed constants.

PART 4. Note that ε_i is the independently and identically distributed residual following the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . One can verify that $E(|\varepsilon_i|) = \sigma\sqrt{2/\pi}$ and $E(\varepsilon_i^2) = \sigma^2$. Then, we have $E\{M_a(\varepsilon_i)\} \leq C_{M_a} < \infty$, where $C_{M_a} = M_1^a \sigma^2 +$

$M_2^a \sigma \sqrt{2/\pi} + M_3^a$. Next, we calculate $\text{var}\{M_a(\varepsilon_i)\}$. Direct computation leads to $M_a^2(\varepsilon_i) = (M_1^a)^2 \varepsilon_i^4 + (M_2^a)^2 \varepsilon_i^2 + (M_3^a)^2 + 2M_1^a M_2^a \varepsilon_i^2 |\varepsilon_i| + 2M_1^a M_3^a \varepsilon_i^2 + 2M_2^a M_3^a |\varepsilon_i|$. One can compute that $E(\varepsilon_i^2 | \varepsilon_i) = 2\sigma^3 \sqrt{2/\pi}$ and $E(\varepsilon_i^4) = 3\sigma^4$. Then, we have $\text{var}\{M_a(\varepsilon_i)\} = E\{M_a^2(\varepsilon_i)\} - \{EM_a(\varepsilon_i)\}^2 \leq C_{M_a}^{(v)}$, where $C_{M_a}^{(v)} = 3(M_1^a)^2 \sigma_{\max}^4 + (M_2^a)^2 \sigma_{\max}^2 + (M_3^a)^2 + 4M_1^a M_2^a \sigma^3 \sqrt{2/\pi} + 2M_1^a M_3^a \sigma^2 + 2M_2^a M_3^a \sigma \sqrt{2/\pi}$ is a positive and fixed constant.

PART 5. Recall that $\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b,i)} = \alpha_{i k_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{i k_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j}) - E(c_{i k_1} c_{i k_2} / M_{ij})$, where $\alpha_{i k}^{(j)} = c_{i k} p_{k j}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{k j})^{1 - Z_{ij}} / \sum_{k=1}^K c_{i k} p_{k j}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{k j})^{1 - Z_{ij}}$, $c_{i k} = \pi_k (\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma)^{-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} / (2\sigma^2)$, $s(Z_{ij}, p_{k j}) = Z_{ij} / p_{k j} - (1 - Z_{ij}) / (1 - p_{k j})$ and $M_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^K c_{i k} p_{k j} \sum_{k=1}^K c_{i k} (1 - p_{k j})$. Note that $\alpha_{i k}^{(j)} \leq 1$ for every k . And $|s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})| \leq p_{\min}^{-2} + (1 - p_{\max})^{-2}$. For $E(c_{i k_1} c_{i k_2} / M_{ij})$, we can obtain that $|E(c_{i k_1} c_{i k_2} / M_{ij})| \leq p_{\min}^{-1} (1 - p_{\max})^{-1}$. Thus, we have $|\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b,i)}| \leq p_m^2$, where $p_m^2 = \{p_{\min}^{-1} + (1 - p_{\max})^{-1}\}^2$. Obviously, $E(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b_1,i)}) = 0$. Next, we calculate $\text{var}(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b,i)}) = E(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b,i)})^2 = E\left[E\left\{(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b,i)})^2 \mid Y_i, X_i\right\}\right]$. Direct computation leads to

$$E\left\{\left(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b,i)}\right)^2 \mid Y_i, X_i\right\} = E\left[\left\{\alpha_{i k_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{i k_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})\right\}^2 \mid Y_i, X_i\right] - \left\{E\left(\frac{c_{i k_1} c_{i k_2}}{M_{ij}} \mid Y_i, X_i\right)\right\}^2.$$

Then, we can compute $\text{var}(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b,i)})$ as

$$\text{var}(\delta_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,b,i)}) = E\left[\frac{c_{i k_1}^2 c_{i k_2}^2}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K c_{i k}\right)^4} \left\{p_{Z_{ij} | Y_i, X_i}^{-3} + (1 - p_{Z_{ij} | Y_i, X_i})^{-3}\right\} - \left\{E\left(\frac{c_{i k_1} c_{i k_2}}{M_{ij}}\right)\right\}^2\right] \leq p_v,$$

where $p_{Z_{ij} | Y_i, X_i} = P(Z_{ij} = 1 | Y_i, X_i) = (\sum_{k=1}^K c_{i k} p_{k j}) / (\sum_{k=1}^K c_{i k})$ and $p_v = p_{\min}^{-3} + (1 - p_{\min})^{-3} + p_{\max}^{-3} + (1 - p_{\max})^{-3}$ is a fixed and positive constant.

PART 6. Here we study $\|\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(\tilde{\Omega})\|$. Recall that $\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} = s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j}) \beta_{i k_1}^{(j)} \beta_{i k_2}^{(j)} / (\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{i k}^{(j)})^2$, where $\beta_{i k}^{(j)} = \pi_k (\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma)^{-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} p_{k j}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{k j})^{1 - Z_{ij}}$ and $s(Z_{ij}, p_{k j}) = (Z_{ij} / p_{k j} - (1 - Z_{ij}) / (1 - p_{k j}))$. Then, we need to calculate $\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(\Omega)$, which is the first-order partial derivative about $\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}$ with respect to $\Omega = (\pi^\top, \gamma^\top, \theta^\top, \sigma)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{2K+q+1}$. Define $S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}} = s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})$, and then we have $|S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}| \leq p_m$ with $p_m = p_{\min}^{-2} + (1 - p_{\min})^{-2}$. We start with $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Direct computation leads to

$$\left|\frac{\partial \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}}{\partial \pi_{k_1}}\right| = \left|\frac{\beta_{i k_1}^{(j)} \beta_{i k_2}^{(j)} S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}}{\pi_{k_1} (\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{i k}^{(j)})^2} - \frac{2(\beta_{i k_1}^{(j)})^2 \beta_{i k_2}^{(j)} S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}}{\pi_{k_1} (\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{i k}^{(j)})^3}\right| \leq \frac{3p_m}{\pi_{\min}}.$$

Similarly, we have $|\partial \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} / \partial \pi_{k_2}| \leq 3p_m \pi_{\min}^{-1}$ and $|\partial \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} / \partial \pi_k| \leq 2p_m \pi_{\min}^{-1}$ for every $k \neq k_1, k_2$. Next, we study $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_K)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$. Here we write \mathcal{K}_i be the real class membership of the i th observation (i.e., $Y_i = \gamma_{\mathcal{K}_i} + X_i^\top \theta + \varepsilon_i$). By the theorem assumptions, we

have

$$\left| \frac{\partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}}{\partial \gamma_{k_1}} \right| = \left| \left\{ \frac{\beta_{ik_1}^{(j)} \beta_{ik_2}^{(j)} S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}}{\left(\sum_{k=1} \beta_{ik}^{(j)} \right)^2} - \frac{2(\beta_{ik_1}^{(j)}) \beta_{ik_2}^{(j)} S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}}{\left(\sum_{k=1} \beta_{ik}^{(j)} \right)^3} \right\} \frac{(Y_i - \gamma_{k_1} - X_i^\top \theta)}{\sigma^2} \right| \leq \frac{3p_m}{\sigma^2} (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|).$$

Similarly, we have $\left| \partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} / \partial \gamma_{k_2} \right| \leq 3p_m (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|) / \sigma^2$ and $\left| \partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} / \partial \gamma_k \right| \leq 2p_m (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|) / \sigma^2$ for every $k \neq k_1, k_2$. We next focus on $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Direct computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}}{\partial \theta} \right\| &= \left\| \left\{ \frac{\beta_{ik_1}^{(j)} \beta_{ik_2}^{(j)} S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}}{\left(\sum_{k=1} \beta_{ik}^{(j)} \right)^2} (2Y_i - \gamma_{k_1} - \gamma_{k_2} - 2X_i^\top \theta) X_i / \sigma^2 \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left\{ \frac{2\beta_{ik_1}^{(j)} \beta_{ik_2}^{(j)} S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}}{\left(\sum_{k=1} \beta_{ik}^{(j)} \right)^3} \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)} (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta) X_i / \sigma^2 \right\} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have $\left\| \partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} / \partial \theta \right\| \leq 2p_m (K+1) (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|) \|X_i\| / \sigma^2$. Finally, we take partial derivative about $\check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}$ with respect to σ as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}}{\partial \sigma} \right| &= \left| \left\{ \frac{\beta_{ik_1}^{(j)} \beta_{ik_2}^{(j)} S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}}{\left(\sum_{k=1} \beta_{ik}^{(j)} \right)^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (Y_i - \gamma_{k_1} - X_i^\top \theta)^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} (Y_i - \gamma_{k_2} - X_i^\top \theta)^2 - 2 \right) / \sigma \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left\{ \frac{2\beta_{ik_1}^{(j)} \beta_{ik_2}^{(j)} S_{k_1 k_2}^{Z_{ij}}}{\left(\sum_{k=1} \beta_{ik}^{(j)} \right)^3} \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{ik}^{(j)} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta)^2 - 1 \right) / \sigma \right\} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\left| \partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} / \partial \sigma \right| \leq 2p_m (K+1) (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|)^2 / \sigma^3 + 2p_m (K+1) / \sigma$. Combining the above results, we can obtain that $\| \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(\Omega) \| \leq C_{K,q} M_b(\varepsilon_i)$, where $C_{K,q} = \sqrt{2K+q+1} > 0$ is a positive constant depending on (K, q) and $M_b(\varepsilon_i) = 2p_m (K+1) (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|)^2 / \sigma^3 + 2p_m (K+1) (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|) \|X_i\| / \sigma^2 + 3p_m (2|\gamma_{\max}| + |\varepsilon_i|) / \sigma^2 + 2p_m (K+1) / \sigma + 3p_m / \pi_{\min}$. $M_b(\varepsilon_i)$ can be formulated as $M_b(\varepsilon_i) = M_1^b \varepsilon_i^2 + M_2^b |\varepsilon_i| + M_3^b$, where $M_1^b > 0$, $M_2^b > 0$ and $M_3^b > 0$ are some fixed constants.

PART 7. By the calculation process in PART 4, we can directly obtain that $E\{M_b(\varepsilon_i)\} = C_{M_b} < \infty$, where $C_{M_b} = M_1^b \sigma^2 + M_2^b \sigma \sqrt{2/\pi} + M_3^b$. Similarly, we can calculate $\text{var}\{M_b(\varepsilon_i)\}$ as $\text{var}\{M_b(\varepsilon_i)\} = E\{M_b^2(\varepsilon_i)\} - \{EM_b(\varepsilon_i)\}^2 \leq C_{M_b}^{(v)}$, where $C_{M_b}^{(v)} = 3(M_1^b)^2 \sigma^4 + (M_2^b)^2 \sigma^2 + (M_3^b)^2 + 4M_1^b M_2^b \sigma^3 \sqrt{2/\pi} + 2M_1^b M_3^b \sigma^2 + 2M_2^b M_3^b \sigma \sqrt{2/\pi}$ is a positive and fixed constant.

PART 8. Recall that $\check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} = \alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j})$, where $\alpha_{ik}^{(j)} = c_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}} / \sum_{k=1}^K c_{ik} p_{kj}^{Z_{ij}} (1 - p_{kj})^{1-Z_{ij}}$, $c_{ik} = \pi_k (\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma)^{-1} \exp\left\{-\left(Y_i - \gamma_k - X_i^\top \theta\right)^2 / (2\sigma^2)\right\}$, and $s(Z_{ij}, p_{kj}) = Z_{ij} / p_{kj} - (1 - Z_{ij}) / (1 - p_{kj})$. Direct computation leads to $\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(p_j) = \partial \check{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)} / \partial p_j = \left(\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2 1}^{(j,i)}(p_j), \dots, \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2 K}^{(j,i)}(p_j) \right) \in \mathbb{R}^K$, where $\ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2 k_3}^{(j,i)}(p_j) = \alpha_{ik_1}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_1 j}) \alpha_{ik_2}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_2 j}) \alpha_{ik_3}^{(j)} s(Z_{ij}, p_{k_3 j})$. By the calculation process in PART 5., we have $\left| \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2 k_3}^{(j,i)}(p_j) \right| \leq p_m^3$. Thus, we can obtain that $\| \ddot{\ell}_{k_1 k_2}^{(j,i)}(\tilde{p}_j) \| \leq p_m^3 \sqrt{K}$.

C.2. Proof of results in Appendix B.2. STEP 1.1.1 We start with $C_1^{(m,k)}$. One can be verify that $|\log(\hat{\pi}_m / \hat{\pi}_k)| \leq |\log \hat{\pi}_m - \log \pi_m| + |\log \hat{\pi}_k - \log \pi_k| + 2|\log \pi_{\max}|$. We

can conduct the Taylor's expansion at π_m as $|\log \widehat{\pi}_m - \log \pi_m| = |\widehat{\pi}_m^{-1}| |\widehat{\pi}_m - \pi_m| \leq \pi_{\min}^{-1} |\widehat{\pi}_m - \pi_m|$, where $\tilde{\pi}_m = \alpha \pi_m + (1 - \alpha) \widehat{\pi}_m$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Similarly, we have $|\log \widehat{\pi}_k - \log \pi_k| \leq \pi_{\min}^{-1} |\widehat{\pi}_k - \pi_k|$. Then, we have $\mathcal{C}_1^{(m,k)} = p^{-1} \max_i |\log(\widehat{\pi}_m / \widehat{\pi}_k)| \leq (p\pi_{\min})^{-1} |\widehat{\pi}_m - \pi_m| + (p\pi_{\min})^{-1} |\widehat{\pi}_k - \pi_k| + 2p^{-1} |\log \pi_{\max}|$. Note that $\widehat{\pi}_k - \pi_k = O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ for every $1 \leq k \leq K$. Thus, we have $\mathcal{C}_1^{(m,k)} = O_p(1/(p\sqrt{n})) + O_p(1/p) = O_p(1/p)$.

STEP 1.1.2 Next, we study $\mathcal{C}_2^{(m,k)}$. Recall that $\mathcal{C}_2^{(m,k)} = 3p^{-1} \max_i (\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_k)^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) = 3p^{-1} \max_i \left\{ (\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_k)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right\} (\sigma / \widehat{\sigma})^2$. By the theorem assumption, we have $(\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_k)^2 / (2\sigma^2) \leq (\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_k)^2 / (2\sigma_{\min}^2)$. Note that $\widehat{\gamma}_k - \gamma_k = O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ for every $1 \leq k \leq K$ and $\widehat{\sigma} - \sigma = O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Then, we have $|\sigma / \widehat{\sigma} - 1| = O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$. Note that these are all independent of the subscript i . Thus, we can obtain that $\mathcal{C}_2^{(m,k)} = O_p(1/(pn))$.

STEP 1.1.3 We then study $\mathcal{C}_3^{(m,k)}$. Note that $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{iq})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is the independently and identically distributed random vector. By the theorem assumption, X_{ij} follows a sub-Gaussian distribution. By definition, we know that $P\{|X_{ij}| > a\} \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 a^2)$ for any $a > 0$, where $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ are some fixed constants. Note that $\|X_i\| = \left(\sum_{j=1}^q X_{ij}^2\right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{q} \max_j |X_{ij}|$. Then, we can obtain that $P\{\max_i \|X_i\| > a\} \leq P\{\max_i \max_j |X_{ij}| > a/\sqrt{q}\} \leq nqC_1 \exp\{-C_2 a^2/q\}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_3^{(m,k)} = 3p^{-1} \sqrt{q} \max_i \max_j |X_{ij}|^2 \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta\|^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2)$. Then using the same technique in STEP 1.1.2, we can obtain that $\mathcal{C}_3^{(m,k)} = O_p(1/(pn))$.

STEP 1.1.4 Finally, we study $\mathcal{C}_4^{(m,k)}$. Recall that $\mathcal{C}_4^{(m,k)} = 3p^{-1} \max_i \varepsilon_i^2 / (2\widehat{\sigma}^2) = 3/(2p) \max_i (\varepsilon_i / \sigma)^2 (\sigma / \widehat{\sigma})^2$. To this end, we shall focus on the asymptotic behavior of $\max_i p^{-1} (\varepsilon_i / \sigma)^2$. Note that ε_i follows a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . By the Chernoff's bound (Chernoff, 1952), we can obtain that $P\{p^{-1} (\varepsilon_i / \sigma)^2 > \varepsilon\} \leq 2 \exp(-\varepsilon p/2)$ for any given $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, we have $P\{\max_i p^{-1} (\varepsilon_i / \sigma)^2 > \varepsilon\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n P\{p^{-1} (\varepsilon_i / \sigma)^2 > \varepsilon\} \leq 2 \exp(-p\varepsilon/2 + \log n)$. Thus, we have $\max_i p^{-1} (\varepsilon_i / \sigma)^2 = O_p(\log n/p)$. We have argued that $|\sigma / \widehat{\sigma} - 1| = O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ in STEP 1.1.2. Thus, we can obtain that $\max_i \mathcal{C}_4^{(m,k)} = O_p(\log n/p)$.

STEP 1.2.1 Recall that $V_{ij}^{(m,k)} = Z_{ij} \log(\widehat{p}_{mj} / \widehat{p}_{kj}) + (1 - Z_{ij}) \log\left\{(1 - \widehat{p}_{mj}) / (1 - \widehat{p}_{kj})\right\}$ and $V_{ij}^{(m,k)} = Z_{ij} \log(p_{mj} / p_{kj}) + (1 - Z_{ij}) \log\left\{(1 - p_{mj}) / (1 - p_{kj})\right\}$. Direct computation leads to $\widehat{V}_{ij}^{(m,k)} - V_{ij}^{(m,k)} = Z_{ij} \left\{ (\log \widehat{p}_{mj} - \log p_{mj}) - (\log \widehat{p}_{kj} - \log p_{kj}) \right\} + (1 - Z_{ij}) \left[\log(1 - \widehat{p}_{mj}) - \log(1 - p_{mj}) \right] - \left[\log(1 - \widehat{p}_{kj}) - \log(1 - p_{kj}) \right]$. By the argument of standard M-estimation, we have $\widehat{p}_{kj} - p_{kj} = O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ for every $1 \leq k \leq K$. Then, we can conduct the Taylor's expansion about $\log \widehat{p}_{kj} - \log p_{kj}$ at p_{kj} as $\log \widehat{p}_{kj} - \log p_{kj} = \widetilde{p}_{kj}^{-1} (\widehat{p}_{kj} - p_{kj})$, where $\widetilde{p}_{kj} \in (p_{kj}, \widehat{p}_{kj})$. By the theorem assumption, we have $|\widetilde{p}_{kj}^{-1}| \leq p_{\min}^{-1}$. As a result, $|\log \widehat{p}_{kj} - \log p_{kj}| \leq p_{\min}^{-1} |\widehat{p}_{kj} - p_{kj}|$ for every $1 \leq k \leq K$. Similarly, we have $|\log(1 - \widehat{p}_{kj}) - \log(1 - p_{kj})| \leq (1 - p_{\max})^{-1} |\widehat{p}_{kj} - p_{kj}|$ for every $1 \leq k \leq K$. Note that

$Z_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ is a binary random variable. Thus, we can obtain that $\left| \widehat{V_{ij}^{(m,k)}} - V_{ij}^{(m,k)} \right| \leq 2p_m |\widehat{p}_{mj} - p_{mj}| + 2p_m |\widehat{p}_{kj} - p_{kj}|$, where $p_m = p_{\min}^{-1} + (1 - p_{\max})^{-1}$.

STEP 1.3.1 Recall that $\mathcal{D}_a = p(\varepsilon_{(\nu, E)}^p)^2/2$ and $\varepsilon_{(\nu, E)}^p = \varepsilon - 2\nu - \sum_{j=1}^p E(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})/p$, which is determined by $\sum_{j=1}^p E(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})/p$. Direct computation leads to $E(V_{ij}^{(m,k)}) = p_{kj} \log(p_{mj}/p_{kj}) + (1 - p_{kj}) \log\{(1 - p_{mj})/(1 - p_{kj})\}$. By the theorem assumptions, we shall have $0 < \Delta_{\min} \leq -\sum_{j=1}^p E(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})/p \leq \Delta_{\max} \leq b$. Here $\Delta_{\max} = p_{\max} \log(p_{\max}/p_{\min}) + (1 - p_{\min}) \log\{(1 - p_{\min})/(1 - p_{\max})\}$. Thus, we obtain that $\mathcal{D}_a \geq C_1 p$, where $C_1 = (\varepsilon - 2\nu + \Delta_{\min})^2/2 > 0$ is a fixed constant.

STEP 1.3.2 By definition, \mathcal{D}_b depends on both $E(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})$ and $\text{var}(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})$. We have argued $E(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})$ in STEP 1.3.1. Next, we shall focus on $\text{var}(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})$. By the theorem assumption (II), we have $\text{var}(V_{ij}^{(m,k)}) \leq C_\sigma$, where $C_\sigma = \log^2 \left[p_{\max}(1 - p_{\min}) / \{p_{\min}(1 - p_{\max})\} \right] / 4$. Therefore, we can obtain $\sum_{j=1}^p \text{var}(V_{ij}^{(m,k)}) \leq p C_\sigma$. Note that $0 < \Delta_{\min} \leq -\sum_{j=1}^p E(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})/p \leq \Delta_{\max} \leq b$. Then, we have $\mathcal{D}_b = \sum_{j=1}^p \text{var}(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})/p + b\varepsilon_{(\nu, E)}^p/3 \leq C_\sigma + b \left\{ \varepsilon - 2\nu - \sum_{j=1}^p E(V_{ij}^{(m,k)})/p \right\} / 3 \leq C_\sigma + b^2$. Thus, we can directly obtain the upper bound of \mathcal{D}_b as $\mathcal{D}_b \leq C_2$, where $C_2 = C_\sigma + b^2 > 0$ is a fixed constant.

C.3. Proof of results in Appendix B.3. Recall that $\Delta_{\text{xx}}^i = X_i^\pi X_i^{\pi^\top} - X_i^a X_i^{a^\top} = (\delta_{j_1, j_2}^i) \in \mathbb{R}^{(K+q) \times (K+q)}$. Here $X_i^a = (a_i^\top, X_i^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K+q}$ with $a_i = (a_{i1}, \dots, a_{iK})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and $X_i^\pi = (\widehat{\pi}_i^\top, X_i^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{K+q}$ with $\widehat{\pi}_i = (\widehat{\pi}_{i1}, \dots, \widehat{\pi}_{iK})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^K$. We need to prove that $\max_{j_1, j_2} |\delta_{j_1, j_2}^i| \leq \max_k |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| (2 + \|X_i\|)$. Note that Δ_{xx}^i is a symmetric matrix. Then, Δ_{xx}^i can be divided into three parts. First for $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq K$, direct computation leads to $\delta_{j_1, j_2}^i = a_{ij_1} a_{ij_2} - \widehat{\pi}_{ij_1} \widehat{\pi}_{ij_2}$. Note that $|a_{ik}| \leq 1$ and $|\widehat{\pi}_{ik}| \leq 1$. Then, we have $|\delta_{j_1, j_2}^i| \leq |a_{ij_1} - \widehat{\pi}_{ij_1}| + |a_{ij_2} - \widehat{\pi}_{ij_2}| \leq 2 \max_k |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}|$. Second for $K+1 \leq j_1 \leq K+q$ and $1 \leq j_2 \leq K$, $\delta_{j_1, j_2}^i = (a_{ij_2} - \widehat{\pi}_{ij_2}) X_{i(j_1-K)}$. Thus, we have $|\delta_{j_1, j_2}^i| \leq \max_k |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| \cdot \|X_i\|$. Third for $K+1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq K+q$, we can immediately obtain that $\delta_{j_1, j_2}^i = 0$ by definition. Combining the above results of those three parts, we completes this verification details for $\max_{j_1, j_2} |\delta_{j_1, j_2}^i| \leq \max_k |\widehat{\pi}_{ik} - a_{ik}| (2 + \|X_i\|)$.