

# REAL-TIME MONITORING WITH RCA MODELS

LAJOS HORVÁTH<sup>1</sup> AND LORENZO TRAPANI<sup>2</sup>

ABSTRACT. We propose a family of *weighted* statistics based on the CUSUM process of the WLS residuals for the online detection of changepoints in a Random Coefficient Autoregressive model, using both the standard CUSUM and the Page-CUSUM process. We derive the asymptotics under the null of no changepoint for all possible weighing schemes, including the case of the standardised CUSUM, for which we derive a Darling-Erdős-type limit theorem; our results guarantee the procedure-wise size control under both an open-ended and a closed-ended monitoring. In addition to considering the standard RCA model with no covariates, we also extend our results to the case of exogenous regressors. Our results can be applied irrespective of (and with no prior knowledge required as to) whether the observations are stationary or not, and irrespective of whether they change into a stationary or nonstationary regime. Hence, our methodology is particularly suited to detect the onset, or the collapse, of a bubble or an epidemic. Our simulations show that our procedures, especially when standardising the CUSUM process, can ensure very good size control and short detection delays. We complement our theory by studying the online detection of breaks in epidemiological and housing prices series.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Economic history is full of events where stationary observations suddenly become explosively increasing, or - vice versa - where explosive trends crash. A classical example are financial bubbles, where periods of “tame” fluctuations are followed by exuberant growth, in turn then followed by a collapse which is typically modelled as a stationary regime (see e.g.

---

<sup>1</sup>DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84112–0090 USA

<sup>2</sup>SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER, LEICESTER, U.K.; DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT, UNIVERSITY OF PAVIA, PAVIA, ITALY

*E-mail addresses:* horvath@math.utah.edu, lt285@leicester.ac.uk

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F17.

*Key words and phrases.* Sequential changepoint detection; Random Coefficient Autoregression; Bubbles; Detection delay.

Harvey et al., 2017; and Phillips and Shi, 2018). Historical examples include the “Tulipmania” in the Netherlands in the 1630’s and the “South Sea” bubble of 1720. More recent instances include the Japan’s real estate and stock market bubble of the 1980’s, which after the collapse turned into a negative period, the so called “Lost Decade”; and, in the US, the “Dotcom” bubble of the 1990’s and the housing bubble between 1996 and 2006. Similar phenomena, with observations undergoing a change in persistence or even more radical changes in their nature (from stationary to explosive and vice versa), are also encountered in applied sciences. For example, in epidemiology, the onset of a pandemic is characterised by a sudden, explosive growth in the number of cases, followed by a return to a stationary regime when the pandemic subsides. Hence the importance of developing tools allowing to test for changes in persistence, or a switch between regimes.

In particular, a research area where this issue has been paid particular attention is financial econometrics, where several methodologies have been developed to tests (ex-ante or ex-post) for the onset or collapse of a financial bubble. In the interest of a concise discussion, we refer the reader to the seminal articles on ex-post detection by Phillips et al. (2011), and Phillips et al. (2015a), and also to Skrobotov (2023) for a review. In addition, several contributions deal with the real-time detection of bubble episodes - see, *inter alia*, Homm and Breitung (2012), Phillips et al. (2015b), and a recent contribution by Whitehouse et al. (2023). A common trait to this literature is that it relies on an Autoregressive (AR) framework as the workhorse model. Using an AR specification has several advantages: it is a parsimonious and well-studied set-up, and it naturally lends itself to modelling both stationary and nonstationary regimes. Phillips and Yu (2011) show that an AR model with explosiveness is an adequate representation for bubble behaviour under very general assumptions. Moreover, an AR specification lends itself to constructing tests for bubble behaviour using the Dickey-Fuller test and its variants- e.g., the Augmented DF test (ADF; see Diba and Grossman, 1988), the sup-ADF test (Phillips et al.,

2011; Phillips and Yu, 2011), and the generalized sup-ADF test (Phillips et al., 2015a; Phillips et al., 2015b). From a technical viewpoint, however, using an AR model is fraught with difficulties when monitoring for changes from an explosive to a stationary regime, although several promising solutions have been proposed such as the reverse regression approach by Phillips and Shi (2018). In addition to the ability of detecting changes, ensuring a timely detection is important. To the best of our knowledge, no optimality results exist; indeed, typical procedures are based on *unweighted* CUSUM (or related) statistics, which are not designed to ensure optimal detection timings (see e.g. Aue and Horváth, 2004).

*Main contributions of this paper*

We address the general issue of online, real-time detection of changes in persistence and also between regimes (i.e., from stationarity to nonstationarity and vice versa) by using a Random Coefficient Autoregressive (RCA) model, viz.

$$(1.1) \quad y_i = (\beta_i + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2},$$

where  $y_0$  denotes an initial value. The RCA model was firstly studied by Anděl (1976) and Nicholls and Quinn (2012). It belongs in the wider class of nonlinear models for time series (see Fan and Yao, 2008), which have been proposed “as a reaction against the supremacy of linear ones - a situation inherited from strong, though often implicit, Gaussian assumptions” (Akharif and Hallin, 2003). The RCA model is particularly well-suited to modelling time series with potentially explosive behaviour; for example, in the seminal paper by Diba and Grossman (1988), a rational bubble is modelled as having an RCA dynamics (see their equation (17)). Model (1.1) also nests, as a special case corresponding to having  $\beta_i = 1$ , the so-called Stochastic Unit Root model (STUR; see Granger and Swanson, 1997), and it also allows for the possibility of (conditional) heteroskedasticity in  $y_i$ ; Tsay (1987) shows that the widely popular ARCH model by Engle (1982) can be cast into the RCA

setup, which therefore can be viewed as a second-order equivalent. Finally, a major advantage of (1.1) compared to standard AR models is that it is possible to construct estimators of  $\beta_0$  that are always asymptotically normal, irrespective of whether  $y_i$  is stationary or non-stationary (Aue and Horváth, 2011). Although the literature has developed several contributions on ex-post changepoint detection using an RCA model (e.g. Horváth and Trapani, 2023), to the best of our knowledge there are still significant limitations in the context of online detection - e.g., Na et al. (2010), Li et al. (2015) and Li et al. (2015) all consider sequential changepoint detection using unweighted CUSUM-based statistics, but only under the maintained assumption of stationarity, which precludes the ability to detect changes from stationary to exponential behaviour, and vice versa.

In this paper, we fill the gaps discussed above, by proposing a family of statistics based on the Weighted Least Squares (WLS) estimator, and in particular on the *weighted* CUSUM process of the WLS residuals, designed to ensure a faster detection than unweighted statistics. We study the standard CUSUM process, and the so-called “Page-CUSUM” (Fremdt, 2015); and both “open-ended” and “closed-ended” procedures, where sequential monitoring goes on indefinitely, or stops at a pre-specified point in time, respectively. We make at least five contributions to the current literature on online changepoint detection. First, we derive the limiting distribution of our statistics under the closed-ended case; typically, in the literature, the critical values obtained under the open-ended case are employed even for the closed-ended case, as a (conservative) choice, ultimately leading to loss of power. Second, we study the case of a closed-ended procedure with a “very short” monitoring horizon, adapting the boundary function for this case, and deriving the corresponding limiting distribution; this case has not been considered in the literature before, but it is of practical relevance because the researcher may prefer to carry out monitoring for a short time, and then - in the absence of changepoints - restart the procedure afresh. Third, in the case of

the *standardised* CUSUM,<sup>1</sup> we propose an approximation to compute critical values which offers a superior alternative to asymptotic critical values, whose accuracy is marred by the notoriously weak convergence to the Extreme Value Distribution; simulations show that our approximation works extremely well even in small samples, and for all cases considered, offering size control and short detection delays. Fourth, we derive the limiting distribution of the *weighted* Page-CUSUM statistics, showing also that such a limit is a well-defined random variable. Fifth, as well as studying the basic RCA model, we also develop the full-blown theory (irrespective of whether  $y_i$  is stationary or not) for the case where there are covariates in (1.1); to the best of our knowledge, this is the first contribution to deal with this case. As a final remark, we would like to add that a major advantage of the RCA set-up is that our statistics can be employed under both stationarity and explosiveness with no modifications required; indeed, no prior knowledge on the stationarity or not of the observations is required. Hence, our methodology can be applied to detect changes in the persistence of a stationary series, or changes from stationarity to a non-stationary regime, or vice versa from a non-stationary regime to a stationary one. This has important practical consequences, allowing for e.g. faster responses from public health authorities in the presence of a pandemic, or from policy makers in the presence of inflationary shocks, or a more accurate date stamping of bubble onsets and collapses.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. We introduce our main model, and the test statistics, in Section 2. The asymptotics under the null and the alternative is reported in Section 3. We consider the extension of the RCA model to the case of exogenous regressors in Section 4. Monte Carlo evidence is in Section 5; Section 6 contains two empirical applications, to Covid-19 hospitalisation data and house prices. Section 7 concludes.

---

<sup>1</sup>We define “standardised CUSUM” the CUSUM process weighted using weights proportional to its standard deviation, as opposed to the “weighted CUSUM” which uses lighter weights - see also below for a formal definition.

NOTATION. Henceforth, we use: “ $\rightarrow$ ” for the ordinary limit; “ $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}}$ ” for convergence in probability; “a.s.” for “almost surely”; “ $\xrightarrow{a.s.}$ ” for almost sure convergence; and “ $\|\cdot\|$ ” for the Euclidean norm of vectors and matrices. Finally,  $\{W(t), 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$  denotes a standard Wiener process. Other notation is introduced later on in the paper.

## 2. SEQUENTIAL MONITORING OF RCA MODELS

Recall the RCA model

$$(2.1) \quad y_i = (\beta_i + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2}.$$

It is well-known (Aue et al., 2006) that, in (2.1), the stationarity or lack thereof of  $y_i$  is determined by the value of  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}|$ :

- if  $-\infty \leq E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , then  $y_i$  converges exponentially fast to a strictly stationary solution  $\{\bar{y}_i, -\infty < i < \infty\}$  for all initial values  $y_0$ ;
- if  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$ , then  $y_i$  is nonstationary with  $|y_i| \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$  exponentially fast (Berkes et al., 2009);
- if  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| = 0$ , then  $|y_i| \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \infty$ , but at a rate slower than exponential (see Lemma A.4 in Horváth and Trapani, 2016).

The following assumption must hold under all three cases above.

**Assumption 2.1.**  $\{(\epsilon_{i,1}, \epsilon_{i,2}), -\infty < i < \infty\}$  are independent and identically distributed random variables with (i)  $E\epsilon_{i,1} = E\epsilon_{i,2} = 0$ ; (ii)  $0 < E\epsilon_{i,1}^2 = \sigma_1^2 < \infty$  and  $0 < E\epsilon_{i,2}^2 = \sigma_2^2 < \infty$ ; (iii)  $E\epsilon_{i,1}\epsilon_{i,2} = 0$ ; (iv)  $E|\epsilon_{i,1}|^\nu < \infty$  and  $E|\epsilon_{i,2}|^\nu < \infty$  for some  $\nu > 2$ .

We further assume that the autoregressive parameter  $\beta_i$  is constant over the training segment  $\{y_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$

**Assumption 2.2.**  $\beta_i = \beta_0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

The requirement in Assumption 2.2 is known as the *non-contamination assumption* (see Chu et al., 1996). We subsequently test for the null hypothesis that, as new data come in after  $m$ ,  $\beta_i$  remains constant, viz.

$$(2.2) \quad H_0 : \beta_0 = \beta_{m+1} = \beta_{m+2} = \dots$$

The WLS estimator using the observations on the training segment  $\{y_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$  is

$$(2.3) \quad \widehat{\beta}_m = \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_i y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right).$$

**2.1. Standard weighted CUSUM-based detectors.** We define the CUSUM process of the WLS residuals as

$$(2.4) \quad Z_m(k) = \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{(y_i - \widehat{\beta}_m y_{i-1}) y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right|, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Heuristically, under the null of no change, the residuals have zero mean; hence, the partial sum process  $Z_m(k)$  - customarily known as the *detector* - should also fluctuate around zero with increasing variance. Conversely, in the presence of a break (at, say,  $k^*$ ),  $\widehat{\beta}_m$  is a biased estimator for the “new” autoregressive parameter  $\beta_{m+k^*+1}$ ; thus,  $Z_m(k)$  should have a drift term. Hence, a break is flagged if  $Z_m(k)$  exceeds a threshold. We call such a threshold the *boundary function*, and propose the following family

$$(2.5) \quad g_{m,\psi}(k) = c_{\alpha,\psi} \delta m^{1/2} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{m} \right) \left( \frac{k}{m+k} \right)^\psi.$$

In (2.5),  $0 \leq \psi \leq 1/2$ , and  $\delta$  is defined as

$$(2.6) \quad \delta^2 = \begin{cases} a_1 \sigma_1^2 + a_2 \sigma_2^2, & \text{if } -\infty \leq E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0, \\ \sigma_1^2, & \text{if } E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

with  $\sigma_1^2$  and  $\sigma_2^2$  defined in Assumption 2.1, and

$$a_1 = E \left( \frac{\bar{y}_0^2}{1 + \bar{y}_0^2} \right)^2, \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 = E \left( \frac{\bar{y}_0}{1 + \bar{y}_0^2} \right)^2,$$

where recall that  $\{\bar{y}_i, -\infty < i < \infty\}$  is the stationary solution of (2.1).

On account of (2.4) and (2.5), a changepoint is found at a stopping time  $\tau_{m,\psi}$  defined as

$$(2.7) \quad \tau_{m,\psi} = \begin{cases} \inf\{k \geq 1 : Z_m(k) \geq g_{m,\psi}(k)\}, \\ \infty, \text{ if } Z_m(k) < g_{m,\psi}(k) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k < \infty. \end{cases}$$

The constant  $c_{\alpha,\psi}$  in (2.5) is chosen so as to ensure that: (a) under the null, the procedure-wise probability of Type I Error does not exceed a user-chosen value  $\alpha$ , viz.  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P\{\tau_{m,\psi} = \infty | H_0\} = \alpha$ ; and (b) under the alternative,  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P\{\tau_{m,\psi} < \infty | H_A\} = 1$ .

In (2.7), the monitoring goes on indefinitely (“open-ended”). On the other hand, in some applications it may be desirable to stop the sequential monitoring procedure after  $m^*$  period (“closed-ended”), e.g. because no break has been detected yet and the training period may be extended or updated. In this case, we use the same detector  $Z_m(k)$  defined in (2.4), but we modify (2.7) as

$$(2.8) \quad \tau_{m,\psi}^* = \begin{cases} \inf\{1 \leq k \leq m^* : Z_m(k) \geq g_{m,\psi}^*(k)\}, \\ m^*, \text{ if } Z_m(k) < g_{m,\psi}^*(k) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq m^*, \end{cases}$$

with boundary function

$$(2.9) \quad g_{m,\psi}^*(k) = c_{\alpha,\psi}^* \delta m^{1/2} (1 + k/m) (k/(m+k))^\psi.$$

The boundary function  $g_{m,\psi}^*(k)$  is suitable for the case where the monitoring horizon  $m^*$  is “long”, i.e. when it goes on for a period which is at least proportional (or more than proportional) to the size of the training sample  $m$ . If a shorter monitoring horizon is



considered, where  $m^* = o(m)$ , then we use the same detector as above,  $Z_m(k)$ , but the boundary function needs to be modified as

$$(2.10) \quad \bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k) = \bar{c}_{\alpha,\psi} \delta (m^*)^{1/2-\psi} k^\psi.$$

In this case, the stopping rule is defined as

$$(2.11) \quad \bar{\tau}_{m,\psi} = \begin{cases} \inf\{1 \leq k \leq m^* : Z_m(k) \geq \bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k)\}, \\ m^*, \text{ if } Z_m(k) < \bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq m^*. \end{cases}$$

**2.2. Page-CUSUM detectors.** In a series of recent contributions, Fremdt (2015), Kirch and Stoehr (2022a) and Kirch and Stoehr (2022b) study a different family of detectors, known as the ‘‘Page-CUSUM’’ processes, designed to offer a shorter detection delay:

$$(2.12) \quad Z_m^\dagger(k) = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \left| \sum_{i=m+\ell}^{m+k} \frac{(y_i - \hat{\beta}_m y_{i-1}) y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right|, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Intuitively, this family of detectors searches for the ‘‘worst-case scenario’’ at each point in time  $k$ , and therefore should guarantee faster detection in the presence of a changepoint. Consistently with the approach studied in this paper, we consider *weighted* versions of  $Z_m^\dagger(k)$ ; the corresponding stopping rules are defined as:

$$(2.13) \quad \tau_{m,\psi}^\dagger = \begin{cases} \inf\{k \geq 1 : Z_m^\dagger(k) \geq g_{m,\psi}(k)\}, \\ \infty, \text{ if } Z_m^\dagger(k) < g_{m,\psi}(k) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k < \infty, \end{cases}$$

with  $g_{m,\psi}(k)$  defined in (2.5), for an open-ended procedure (replacing the critical value  $c_{\alpha,\psi}$  with  $c_{\alpha,\psi}^\dagger$ );

$$(2.14) \quad \tau_{m,\psi}^{*\dagger} = \begin{cases} \inf\{1 \leq k \leq m^* : Z_m^\dagger(k) \geq g_{m,\psi}^*(k)\}, \\ m^*, \text{ if } Z_m^\dagger(k) < g_{m,\psi}^*(k) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq m^*, \end{cases}$$

with  $g_{m,\psi}^*(k)$  defined in (2.9), for the case of a closed-ended procedure with a long monitoring horizon (replacing the critical value  $c_{\alpha,\psi}^*$  with  $c_{\alpha,\psi}^{*\dagger}$ ); and

$$(2.15) \quad \bar{\tau}_{m,\psi}^\dagger = \begin{cases} \inf\{1 \leq k \leq m^* : Z_m^\dagger(k) \geq \bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k)\}, \\ m^*, \text{ if } Z_m^\dagger(k) < \bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq m^*, \end{cases}$$

with  $\bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k)$  defined in (2.10), for the case of a closed-ended procedure with a short monitoring horizon (replacing the critical value  $\bar{c}_{\alpha,\psi}$  with  $\bar{c}_{\alpha,\psi}^\dagger$ ).

### 3. ASYMPTOTICS

We begin by listing a set of technical assumptions, which complement Assumption 2.1 and are required in the case of nonstationarity,  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$ .

**Assumption 3.1.** *If  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$ , it holds that: (i)  $\epsilon_{0,2}$  has a bounded density; (ii)  $\{\epsilon_{i,1}, -\infty < i < \infty\}$  and  $\{\epsilon_{i,2}, -\infty < i < \infty\}$  are independent.*

**Assumption 3.2.** *If  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$ , it holds that  $P\{(\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1})y_0 + \epsilon_{0,2} = x\} = 0$  for all  $-\infty < x < \infty$ .*

Assumption 3.1 is required specifically in order to derive the anti-concentration bound in (C.31). Assumption 3.2 ensures that  $|y_i| \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ , ruling out that it could be identically equal to zero (see Berkes et al., 2009).

**3.1. Asymptotics under the null.** We derive the weak limits of our test statistics. Results differ depending on the choice of the weight  $\psi$ , on whether an open-ended or a closed-ended monitoring scheme is used (and, in the latter case, on the length of the monitoring horizon), and on whether the detector is constructed using the standard CUSUM or the Page-CUSUM. In all cases, we derive nuisance free limiting distributions, from which critical values can be obtained by simulation for a given desired nominal significance level,  $\alpha$ .

**3.1.1. Weighted standard CUSUM-based detectors.** We begin by studying the standard CUSUM detectors defined in Section 2.1, starting with the open-ended case, also studied in Horváth et al. (2004) in the context of a linear regression.

**Theorem 3.1.** *We assume that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold, and that either: (i)  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$  holds; or (ii)  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| = 0$  and Assumption 3.1 hold; or (iii)  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$  and Assumptions 3.1-3.2 hold. Then, under  $H_0$  it holds that, for all  $\psi < 1/2$*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \{ \tau_{m,\psi} = \infty \} = P \left\{ \sup_{0 < u \leq 1} \frac{|W(u)|}{u^\psi} < c_{\alpha,\psi} \right\}.$$

We now turn to the closed-ended case. We begin by considering the case of (2.8), where the monitoring goes on for a sufficient amount of time:

$$(3.1) \quad m^* = O(m^\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \geq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m^*}{m} = m_0 \in (0, \infty] > 0.$$

In this case, we use the boundary function  $g_{m,\psi}^*(k)$  defined in (2.9), and the corresponding stopping rule (2.8). Define  $m_* = m_0 / (1 + m_0)$  if  $m_0 < \infty$ , and  $m_* = 1$  if  $m_0 = \infty$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *We assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.1, and (3.1), are satisfied. Then, under  $H_0$  it holds that, for all  $\psi < 1/2$*

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \{ \tau_{m,\psi}^* = \infty \} = P \left\{ \sup_{0 < u \leq m_*} \frac{|W(u)|}{u^\psi} < c_{\alpha,\psi}^* \right\}.$$

We now study the case of (2.11), in a closed-ended set-up where monitoring stops after very few steps, viz.

$$(3.3) \quad m^* \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m^*}{m} = 0.$$

In this case, we use the boundary function  $\bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k)$  defined in (2.10), and the corresponding stopping rule defined in (2.11).

**Theorem 3.3.** *We assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.1 and (3.3) are satisfied. Then, under  $H_0$  it holds that, for all  $\psi < 1/2$*

$$(3.4) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \{ \bar{\tau}_{m,\psi} = \infty \} = P \left\{ \sup_{0 < u \leq 1} \frac{|W(u)|}{u^\psi} < \bar{c}_{\alpha,\psi} \right\}.$$

We now turn to the case  $\psi = 1/2$ , studying the closed-ended monitoring procedure under both (3.1) and (3.3). Define

$$(3.5) \quad \gamma(x) = \sqrt{2 \log x} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(x) = 2 \log x + \frac{1}{2} \log \log x - \frac{1}{2} \log \pi,$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad c_{\alpha,0.5}^* = \bar{c}_{\alpha,0.5} = \frac{x + \delta(\log m^*)}{\gamma(\log m^*)}.$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *We assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Then, under  $H_0$  for all  $-\infty < x < \infty$ :*

- if (3.1) holds, then it holds that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \{ \tau_{m,0.5}^* = m^* \} = \exp(-\exp(-x))$ ;
- if (3.3) holds, then it holds that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \{ \bar{\tau}_{m,0.5} = m^* \} = \exp(-\exp(-x))$ .

Upon inspecting the proofs of Theorems 3.1-3.3 and 3.4, the limiting distributions of the weighted CUSUM with  $\psi < 1/2$ , and of the standardised CUSUM with  $\psi = 1/2$  are asymptotically independent,<sup>2</sup> and therefore the two procedures, in principle, can be combined.

Theorem 3.4 offers an explicit formula to compute asymptotic critical values; however, these are bound to be inaccurate due to the slow convergence to the Extreme Value distribution. In particular, simulations show that, in finite samples, asymptotic critical values overstate the true values thus leading to low power. A possible correction can be proposed along similar lines as Gombay and Horváth (1996), as follows. Define the sequence  $h_{m^*} = h_{m^*}(m^*)$  such that, as  $m^* \rightarrow \infty$

$$(3.7) \quad h_{m^*} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad h_{m^*}/m^* \rightarrow 0,$$

and let  $\phi_m = (m^* + h_{m^*}) / (2h_{m^*})$ . Let also  $\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5} \rightarrow \infty$  denote the solution of

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}^2\right)}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} \left( \log \phi_m + \frac{4 - \log \phi_m}{\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}^2} \right) = \alpha.$$

**Theorem 3.5.** *We assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.4 are satisfied. Then, replacing  $c_{\alpha,0.5}^*$  and  $\bar{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  with  $\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  defined in (3.8), it holds that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P\{\tau_{m,0.5}^* = m^*\} = \alpha$  and  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P\{\bar{\tau}_{m,0.5} = m^*\} = \alpha$  respectively.*

The choice of  $h_{m^*}$  is a matter of tuning; qualitatively, as  $h_{m^*}$  increases, critical values become smaller (thus making the procedure more conservative) and vice versa. Our simulations indicate that  $h_{m^*} = (\log m^*)^{1/2}$  yields the best results in terms of size and power.

**3.1.2. Weighted Page-CUSUM detectors.** We now consider the use of the Page-CUSUM detector  $Z_m^\dagger(k)$  defined in (2.12), using the stopping rules defined in (2.13)-(2.15). Let  $\{W_1(x), x \geq 0\}$  and  $\{W_2(x), x \geq 0\}$  denote two independent standard Wiener processes.

---

<sup>2</sup>Intuitively, this is because  $W(\cdot)$  has independent increments, and the limiting distribution, in the case of  $0 \leq \psi < 1/2$ , is determined by the ‘‘central’’ values of  $W(\cdot)$ ; conversely, when  $\psi = 1/2$ , the limiting law is determined by values at the very beginning of  $W(\cdot)$ .

**Theorem 3.6.** *We assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Then, under  $H_0$ , for all  $\psi < 1/2$*

- *it holds that*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \tau_{m,\psi}^\dagger = \infty \right\} = P \left\{ \sup_{0 < x < \infty} \frac{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t)) - (x-t)W_1(1)|}{(1+x)(x/(1+x))^\psi} < c_{\alpha,\psi}^\dagger \right\};$$

- *if, in addition, (3.1) holds, then it holds that*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \tau_{m,\psi}^{\dagger*} = \infty \right\} = P \left\{ \sup_{0 < x \leq m_0} \frac{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t)) - (x-t)W_1(1)|}{(1+x)(x/(1+x))^\psi} < c_{\alpha,\psi}^{\dagger*} \right\};$$

- *if, in addition, (3.3) holds, then it holds that*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \bar{\tau}_{m,\psi}^\dagger = \infty \right\} = P \left\{ \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \frac{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W(x) - W(t))|}{x^\psi} < \bar{c}_{\alpha,\psi}^\dagger \right\}.$$

**3.1.3. LRV estimation.** In order to apply all the results above, we require an estimate of  $s^2$  defined in (2.6). This can be constructed using the data in the training sample as

$$(3.9) \quad \hat{s}_m^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \frac{(y_i - \hat{\beta}_m y_{i-1}) y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^2.$$

**Corollary 3.1.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, it holds that  $\hat{s}_m^2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} s^2$ .*

We note that  $\hat{s}_m^2$  does not depend on  $\psi$ , so the result in Corollary 3.1 can be applied for all  $0 \leq \psi \leq 1/2$ , and for both open-ended and closed-ended procedures.

**3.2. Asymptotics under the alternative.** We consider the following alternative, where the deterministic part of the autoregressive coefficient of (2.1) undergoes a change

$$(3.10) \quad y_i = \begin{cases} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2} & 1 \leq i \leq m + k^*, \\ (\beta_A + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2} & i > m + k^*, \end{cases}$$

where  $\beta_0 \neq \beta_A$  and  $k^*$  is the time of change. In (3.10), we do not put any constraints on the values of  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_A$ . Hence, under (3.10), the observations could transition from a stationary regime to another stationary regime (if both  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$  and  $E \log |\beta_A + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ ); from a nonstationary regime to another nonstationary regime (if both  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$  and  $E \log |\beta_A + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$ ); or either regime can be stationary and the other one nonstationary (which arises if  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$  and  $E \log |\beta_A + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$ , implying a switch from stationarity to nonstationarity, or if  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$  and  $E \log |\beta_A + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , implying a switch from nonstationarity to stationarity). We entertain the possibility that the amplitude of change may depend on the (training) sample size  $m$ , thus defining

$$(3.11) \quad \Delta_m = \beta_A - \beta_0.$$

**Theorem 3.7.** *We assume that (3.10) holds with  $k^* = O(m)$ . Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1, if it holds that*

$$(3.12) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m^{1/2} |\Delta_m| = \infty,$$

*then it holds that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \{ \tau_{m,\psi} < \infty | H_A \} = 1$ , for all  $\psi < 1/2$ . Under the conditions of Theorem 3.4, if it holds that*

$$(3.13) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m^{1/2} |\Delta_m|}{\sqrt{\log \log m}} = \infty,$$

*then it holds that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \{ \tau_{m,0.5}^* < \infty | H_A \} = 1$ . The same results hold under the conditions of Theorem 3.2; and under the conditions of Theorem 3.3 upon replacing  $m$  with  $m^*$  in (3.12) and (3.13). The same results also hold, for  $\psi < 1/2$ , using the procedures based on the Page-CUSUM detector  $Z_m^\dagger(k)$  defined in (2.13)-(2.15).*

Condition (3.12) entails that  $|\Delta_m|$  can drift to zero, but not too fast (i.e., power is ensured as long as breaks are “not too small”), for all  $\psi < 1/2$ . When using  $\psi = 1/2$ , condition

(3.13) suggests that there is a (minor) loss of power. A straightforward extension of the proofs in Aue and Horváth (2004) and Aue et al. (2008) would yield that the detection delay is proportional to  $m^{(1-2\psi)/(2(1-\psi))}$  when  $\psi < 1/2$ , and to  $\log \log m$  when  $\psi = 1/2$ , thus indicating that heavier weights ensure faster detection.

#### 4. MONITORING THE RCA MODEL WITH COVARIATES

In a recent contribution, Astill et al. (2023) argue in favour of adding covariates to the basic AR specification, showing theoretically and empirically that this results in better (and quicker) detection of bubble episodes. Hence, we modify (2.1) as

$$(4.1) \quad y_i = (\beta_i + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{x}_i + \epsilon_{i,2},$$

where  $y_0$  is an initial value and  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . Equation (4.1) is, essentially, a dynamic model with exogenous covariates, with  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$  constant over time.

In order to monitor for the stability of the autoregressive coefficient, we propose again a detector based on the WLS loss function

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{G}_m(\beta, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{(y_i - \beta y_{i-1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \mathbf{x}_i)^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2}.$$

The estimators of  $\beta_0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$  are defined as  $(\hat{\beta}_m, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_m) = \arg \min_{\beta, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{G}_m(\beta, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ , and satisfy

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \mathcal{G}_m(\hat{\beta}_m, \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_m) = -2 \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{(y_i - \hat{\beta}_m y_{i-1} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_m^\top \mathbf{x}_i) y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} = 0,$$

which suggests the following detector

$$(4.4) \quad Z_m^X(k) = \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{(y_i - \hat{\beta}_m y_{i-1} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_m^\top \mathbf{x}_i) y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right|.$$

The following assumptions complement Assumptions 2.1-3.2.



**Assumption 4.1.** (i)  $E \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^{\kappa_1} < \infty$  for some  $\kappa_1 > 4$ ; (ii)  $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{g}(\eta_i, \eta_{i-1}, \dots)$ , where  $\mathbf{g} : \mathcal{S}^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$  is a non-random, measurable function and  $\{\eta_i, -\infty < i < \infty\}$  are i.i.d. random variables with values in the measurable space  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $(E \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_{i,j}^*\|^{\kappa_1})^{1/\kappa_1} \leq c_0 j^{-\kappa_2}$ , with some  $c_0 > 0$  and  $\kappa_2 > 2$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^* = \mathbf{g}(\eta_i, \dots, \eta_{i-j+1}, \eta_{i-j,i,j}^*, \eta_{i-j-1,i,j}^*, \dots)$  where  $\{\eta_{\ell,i,j}^*, -\infty < \ell, i, j < \infty\}$  are i.i.d. random copies of  $\eta_0$ , independent of  $\{\eta_i, -\infty < i < \infty\}$ .

**Assumption 4.2.**  $\{(\epsilon_{i,1}, \epsilon_{i,2}), -\infty < i < \infty\}$  and  $\{\eta_i, -\infty < i < \infty\}$  are independent.

**Assumption 4.3.** If  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$ , it holds that  $P\{(\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1})y_0 + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \mathbf{x}_0 + \epsilon_{0,2} = x\} = 0$  for all  $x$ .

Assumption 4.1 states that the regressors  $\mathbf{x}_i$  form a decomposable Bernoulli shift - i.e., a weakly dependent, stationary process which can be well-approximated by an  $m$ -dependent sequence. The concepts of Bernoulli shift and decomposability appeared first in Ibragimov (1962); see also Wu (2005) and Berkes et al. (2011). Bernoulli shifts have proven a convenient way to model dependent time series, mainly due to their generality and to the fact that they are much easier to verify than e.g. mixing conditions: Aue et al. (2009) and Liu and Lin (2009), *inter alia*, provide numerous examples of such DGPs, which include ARMA models, ARCH/GARCH sequences, and other nonlinear time series models (such as e.g. random coefficient autoregressive models and threshold models). Indeed, under stationarity,  $y_i$  itself can be approximated by a decomposable Bernoulli shift (Horváth and Trapani, 2023). Assumption 4.2 states that the exogenous variables  $\mathbf{x}_i$  are independent of the innovations  $\epsilon_{i,1}$  and  $\epsilon_{i,2}$ , and Assumption 4.3 is similar to Assumption 3.2, ensuring  $|y_i| \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ .

Finally, we note that, in the presence of covariates, we need to exclude the boundary case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| = 0$ ; this is because we would need an exact (and large enough) rate of divergence for  $|y_i|$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , but this result is not available in the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| = 0$  (see also Theorem 4 in Horváth and Trapani, 2019, and the discussion thereafter).

The boundary function is defined as

$$(4.5) \quad g_{m,\psi}^{(x)}(k) = c_{\alpha,\psi}^{(x)} \delta_x^2 m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{\delta_{x,d}^2 m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{\delta_{x,d}^2 m + k}\right)^\psi,$$

where  $c_{\alpha,\psi}^{(x)}$  is a critical value, and

$$(4.6) \quad \delta_x^2 = \begin{cases} \delta_{x,2}^2 / \delta_{x,1}^2, & \text{if } -\infty \leq E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0, \\ \sigma_1^2, & \text{if } E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0, \end{cases}$$

$$\delta_{x,d}^2 = \begin{cases} \delta_{x,2}^2 / \delta_{x,1}^2, & \text{if } -\infty \leq E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0, \\ 1, & \text{if } E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0, \end{cases}$$

with

$$(4.7) \quad \delta_{x,1}^2 = \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{a}, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{x,2}^2 = \sigma_1^2 E \left( \frac{\bar{y}_0^2}{1 + \bar{y}_0^2} \right)^2 + \sigma_2^2 E \left( \frac{\bar{y}_0}{1 + \bar{y}_0^2} \right)^2,$$

where  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  are defined in (C.26)-(C.28) in the Supplement. The stopping rule is

$$(4.8) \quad \tau_{m,\psi}^{(x)} = \begin{cases} \inf\{k \geq 1 : Z_m^X(k) \geq g_{m,\psi}^{(x)}(k)\}, \\ \infty, & \text{if } Z_m^X(k) < g_{m,\psi}^{(x)}(k) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k < \infty, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.9) \quad \tau_{m,\psi}^{*(x)} = \begin{cases} \inf\{k \geq 1 : Z_m^X(k) \geq g_{m,\psi}^{(x)}(k)\}, \\ m^*, & \text{if } Z_m^X(k) < g_{m,\psi}^{(x)}(k) \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq m^*, \end{cases}$$

for an open-ended and a closed-ended monitoring procedure respectively.

**Theorem 4.1.** *We assume that Assumptions 2.1, 4.1, and 4.2 are satisfied, and either (i)  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , or (ii)  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$  and Assumption 4.3 hold. Then, under  $H_0$ , the results of Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold for  $\tau_{m,\psi}^{(x)}$ ,  $\tau_{m,\psi}^{*(x)}$  and  $\bar{\tau}_{m,\psi}^{(x)}$  respectively.*

**Theorem 4.2.** *We assume that the conditions of Theorem 4.1 are satisfied. Then, for  $\psi = 1/2$ , under  $H_0$ , the same results as in Theorem 3.4 hold.*

Along the same lines as in Section 3.1.2, it is possible to construct weighted monitoring schemes based on the detector

$$(4.10) \quad Z_m^{\dagger(X)}(k) = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \left| \sum_{i=m+\ell}^{m+k} \frac{(y_i - \hat{\beta}_m y_{i-1} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_m^\top \mathbf{x}_i) y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right|, \quad k \geq 1.$$

**Theorem 4.3.** *We assume that Assumptions 2.1, 4.1, and 4.2, and (3.1), are satisfied, and either (i)  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , or (ii)  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$  and Assumption 4.3 hold. Then, under  $H_0$ , the results of Theorem 3.6 hold.*

In all the results above, the limiting behaviour of the stopping time is the same as in the absence of covariates; however, this does not mean that these do not play a role, since they build into the recursion that defines  $y_i$ . As far as Theorem 4.2 is concerned, the same approximation for critical values as in (3.8) can be used.

Under the alternative that the deterministic part of the autoregressive root changes,

$$(4.11) \quad y_i = \begin{cases} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{x}_i + \epsilon_{i,2} & 1 \leq i \leq m + k^*, \\ (\beta_A + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{x}_i + \epsilon_{i,2} & i > m + k^*, \end{cases}$$

the same results as in Section 3.2 hold, as summarised in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.4.** *We assume that the conditions of Theorem 4.1 are satisfied. Then, under (4.11), the same results as in Theorem 3.7 hold.*

## 5. SIMULATIONS

We provide some Monte Carlo evidence and guidelines on implementation; further details and results are reported in Section A in the Supplement. We consider the following Data

Generating Process, based on (4.1)

$$(5.1) \quad y_i = (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \lambda_0 x_i + \epsilon_{i,2},$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq m + 1,000$ , where we simulate  $\epsilon_{i,1}$  and  $\epsilon_{i,2}$  as independent of one another and *i.i.d.* with distributions  $N(0, \sigma_1^2)$  and  $N(0, \sigma_2^2)$  respectively, discarding the first 1,000 observations to avoid dependence on initial conditions. We used  $\sigma_1^2 = 0.01$  in all experiments, and we have considered three cases: in **Case I**, we set  $\beta_0 = 0.5$ , with  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i,1}| = -0.717$ , corresponding to a stationary regime; in **Case II**, we set  $\beta_0 = 1.05$ , with  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i,1}| = 0.044$ , corresponding to a mildly explosive regime; and in **Case III**, we set  $\beta_0 = 1$ , with  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i,1}| = -0.007$ , indicating a stationary, but “nearly non-stationary” process (this case corresponds to the STUR model). The variance of the idiosyncratic shock is  $\sigma_2^2 = 0.5$  in Case I, and  $\sigma_2^2 = 0.1$  in Cases II and III; we note however that, in unreported simulations, using different values does not result in any significant changes, save for the (expected) fact that tests have better properties (in terms of size and power) for smaller values of  $\sigma_2^2$ . When covariates are used, we set  $\lambda_0 = 1$  and generate  $x_i$  as *i.i.d.*  $N(0, 1)$ . Critical values (for a nominal level equal to 5%) are computed using the results in Theorem 3.2 when using the weighted CUSUM with  $\psi < 1/2$ , and Theorem 3.6(ii) when using Page-CUSUM statistics. When using the weighted CUSUM with  $\psi = 1/2$ , we use both the asymptotic critical values  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$  defined in (3.6), and the approximation  $\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  defined as the solution of (3.8), with  $h_{m^*} = (\log m^*)^{1/2}$ . Results are based on 1,000 replications.

Empirical rejection frequencies are in Tables 5.1-5.3, where we consider the case where, in (5.1),  $\lambda_0 = 0$  - i.e., a “pure” RCA without covariates. In the case of stationarity (Table 5.1), the procedure-wise probability of Type I Errors is always controlled when using  $\psi = 1/2$ ; the asymptotic critical values  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$  defined in (3.6) lead to under-rejection, as can be

expected in light of the slow convergence to the asymptotic distribution; conversely, their approximation using  $\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  defined as the solution of (3.8) achieves size control in all cases considered. When using  $\psi < 1/2$ , both in the case of the CUSUM and the Page-CUSUM, the procedure-wise probability of Type I Errors is also controlled, but larger sample sizes  $m$  are required. In the explosive case (Table 5.2), our procedures tend to under-reject whenever using  $\psi = 1/2$  (both with  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$  and  $\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$ ), although this seems to slowly improve as  $m$  increases, for all lengths of the monitoring horizon  $m^*$ ; results are less conservative when using  $\psi < 1/2$ , again both in the case of the CUSUM and the Page-CUSUM. On the other hand, in the STUR case (Table 5.3), empirical rejection frequencies tend to be higher than in the other cases. The procedure-wise probability of Type I Errors is controlled in all cases when using  $\psi = 1/2$  and  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$ , whereas using  $\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  requires either large  $m$  ( $\geq 200$ ), or not overly long monitoring horizons when  $m < 200$  (in those cases, using  $m^* \leq m$  always results in size control). When  $\psi < 1/2$ , size control is more problematic and the procedure tends to be oversized, unless  $m^*$  is “small” compared to  $m$ . Whilst results are broadly similar for the CUSUM and the Page-CUSUM, we note that the latter yields marginally improved size control over the former.

The main message of Tables 5.1-5.3 is that, broadly speaking, using the CUSUM with  $\psi = 1/2$  seems the preferred solution across all cases considered. The choice between  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$  and  $\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  essentially depends on  $m$  (and  $m^*$ ), but in the vast majority of the cases considered, using  $\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  offers excellent size control without having an overly conservative procedure. Our results suggest avoiding overly long monitoring horizons when  $m \leq 100$ . In these cases, monitoring can be carried out firstly over a short horizon and, if no changepoints are detected, the procedure can be started afresh including the previous monitoring horizon within the training sample. In Tables A.1-A.3 in the Supplement, we report empirical rejection frequencies in the presence of covariates in (5.1). Results are broadly similar, but empirical rejection frequencies increase in all cases considered. In the stationary case

(Table A.1), results are essentially the same, and, in the explosive case (Table A.2), the increase in empirical rejection frequencies leads to improvements, making the procedure less conservative. The latter result is interesting, and it suggests that sequential monitoring during a bubble phase may benefit from including control variables in the price dynamics. On the other hand, results worsen in the STUR case (Table A.3), and the procedures tend to (sometimes massively) over-reject. The best results are obtained with  $\psi = 1/2$  and  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$ , which achieves size control at least when  $m > 50$  (or when  $m \leq 50$ , but the monitoring horizon is not too long, i.e.  $m^* \leq m$ ). This suggests that, when covariates are included in the basic RCA specification,  $\psi = 1/2$  and  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$  should be employed - this is especially recommended when trying to detect the inception of a bubble from a near stationary regime.

We would like to emphasize that all the cases considered above are fully under the researcher's control: whether to include covariates or not, and the length of the monitoring horizon  $m^*$ , can be decided *a priori*; as mentioned above, preliminary analysis on  $y_i$  during the training period offers further help.

Under the alternative, monitoring is carried out for  $m + 1 \leq i \leq m + m^*$ , with the same specifications as in Cases I-III and

$$(5.2) \quad y_i = (\beta_0 + \Delta I(i \geq m + 1) + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \lambda_0 x_i + \epsilon_{i,2}.$$

We set:  $\Delta = 0.5$  under Case I, with  $\beta_A = 0.75$  and  $E \log |\beta_A + \epsilon_{i,1}| = -0.298$ , thus having a change in persistence with  $y_i$  stationary under the null and the alternative;  $\Delta = -0.1$  under Case II, with  $\beta_A = 0.969$  and  $E \log |\beta_A + \epsilon_{i,1}| = -0.063$ , thus having a change from nonstationarity to stationarity between the null and the alternative; and  $\Delta = 0.1$  under Case III, with  $\beta_A = 1.1$  and  $E \log |\beta_A + \epsilon_{i,1}| = 0.089$ , thus having a change from stationarity to nonstationarity between the null and the alternative. Median delays and

TABLE 5.1. Empirical rejection frequencies under the null of no changepoint and no covariates - Case I,  $\beta_0 = 0.5$

		Weighted CUSUM			Standardised CUSUM		Weighted Page-CUSUM			
		$\psi$	0	0.25	0.45	0.5		0	0.25	0.45
						$c_{\alpha,0.5}$	$\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$			
$m$	$m^*$									
50	25		0.047	0.057	0.045	0.023	0.045	0.045	0.057	0.054
	50		0.068	0.081	0.066	0.034	0.055	0.060	0.080	0.069
	100		0.064	0.079	0.070	0.036	0.053	0.058	0.052	0.061
	200		0.092	0.107	0.086	0.038	0.057	0.087	0.089	0.083
100	50		0.063	0.068	0.055	0.025	0.048	0.061	0.066	0.054
	100		0.057	0.067	0.075	0.027	0.056	0.059	0.066	0.063
	200		0.062	0.062	0.066	0.029	0.048	0.059	0.055	0.060
	400		0.062	0.061	0.054	0.028	0.050	0.062	0.064	0.061
200	100		0.060	0.064	0.053	0.020	0.034	0.050	0.056	0.058
	200		0.049	0.063	0.058	0.023	0.044	0.045	0.058	0.055
	400		0.057	0.057	0.060	0.023	0.042	0.055	0.057	0.052
	800		0.049	0.050	0.056	0.024	0.048	0.047	0.062	0.067

empirical rejection frequencies for  $m = 200$ , under the case of no covariates ( $\lambda_0 = 0$ ), are in Table 5.4.

Under stationarity, using  $\psi = 0.45$  yields the best results in terms of delay and power, with little difference between the CUSUM and the Page-CUSUM (with the latter occasionally delivering higher power, if not shorter detection delays); results are anyway satisfactory also when using  $\psi = 1/2$  with  $\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$ , which is always either the best or the second best in terms of detection delay. The same results are observed in the explosive and in the STUR cases. The latter is particularly remarkable: using  $\psi = 1/2$  with  $\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  delivers essentially the same performance as using  $\psi = 0.45$ ; however, according to Table 5.3, the latter choice yields an oversized procedure, thus making its performance under the alternative less reliable. Hence, Table 5.4 essentially indicates that using  $\psi = 1/2$  with  $\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  yields the best results

TABLE 5.2. Empirical rejection frequencies under the null of no changepoint and no covariates - Case II,  $\beta_0 = 1.05$

		Weighted CUSUM			Standardised CUSUM		Weighted Page-CUSUM			
		$\psi$	0	0.25	0.45	0.5		0	0.25	0.45
						$c_{\alpha,0.5}$	$\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$			
$m$	$m^*$									
50	25		0.035	0.042	0.026	0.011	0.022	0.027	0.037	0.030
	50		0.046	0.051	0.040	0.012	0.029	0.044	0.054	0.039
	100		0.033	0.049	0.027	0.009	0.023	0.028	0.026	0.025
	200		0.055	0.063	0.044	0.018	0.034	0.051	0.056	0.047
100	50		0.044	0.043	0.030	0.008	0.020	0.033	0.038	0.027
	100		0.033	0.036	0.039	0.015	0.025	0.034	0.034	0.028
	200		0.054	0.052	0.041	0.009	0.019	0.051	0.040	0.024
	400		0.059	0.050	0.046	0.014	0.035	0.052	0.055	0.044
200	100		0.047	0.049	0.034	0.015	0.027	0.039	0.040	0.038
	200		0.041	0.055	0.050	0.022	0.036	0.041	0.055	0.047
	400		0.051	0.054	0.053	0.015	0.037	0.049	0.046	0.046
	800		0.042	0.042	0.047	0.013	0.023	0.037	0.048	0.047

in terms of timeliness of detection and power. As a final remark, detection delays worsen as  $m^*$  increases; this is a natural phenomenon, since critical values (see e.g. Corollary 3.2) increase with  $m^*$ , thus making detection, *ceteris paribus*, more infrequent. In Table A.4 in the Supplement, we report median delays and empirical rejection frequencies in the presence of covariates in the basic RCA specification. Our guidelines based on size control suggest using  $\psi = 1/2$  with  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$  in this case; median delays appear very satisfactory, although the cases  $\psi = 1/2$  with  $\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  and especially  $\psi = 0.45$  perform better in several cases.

In conclusion, the results in this section show that online changepoint detection in an RCA model based on weighted CUSUM statistics seems to work very well both under stationarity and nonstationarity. Broadly speaking, in the latter case using the *standardised* CUSUM



TABLE 5.3. Empirical rejection frequencies under the null of no changepoint and no covariates - Case III,  $\beta_0 = 1$

		Weighted CUSUM			Standardised CUSUM		Weighted Page-CUSUM			
		$\psi$	0	0.25	0.45	0.5		0	0.25	0.45
						$c_{\alpha,0.5}$	$\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$			
$m$	$m^*$									
50	25		0.070	0.069	0.053	0.028	0.047	0.062	0.072	0.058
	50		0.068	0.073	0.055	0.031	0.044	0.066	0.076	0.058
	100		0.092	0.100	0.078	0.053	0.070	0.089	0.076	0.076
	200		0.111	0.114	0.092	0.055	0.073	0.109	0.098	0.091
100	50		0.070	0.068	0.049	0.020	0.037	0.064	0.070	0.049
	100		0.075	0.082	0.072	0.038	0.057	0.077	0.078	0.069
	200		0.095	0.099	0.085	0.047	0.067	0.092	0.083	0.077
	400		0.111	0.100	0.089	0.057	0.076	0.106	0.106	0.092
200	100		0.060	0.066	0.051	0.024	0.040	0.057	0.058	0.052
	200		0.093	0.102	0.096	0.045	0.059	0.090	0.097	0.083
	400		0.076	0.079	0.071	0.032	0.060	0.078	0.076	0.072
	800		0.093	0.087	0.082	0.040	0.057	0.085	0.096	0.088

(i.e.,  $\psi = 1/2$ ) is the preferred choice; in the former case, choosing  $\psi$  close to (but smaller than)  $1/2$ , appears to yield the best compromise between size control and timely detection.

## 6. EMPIRICAL APPLICATIONS: FINDING BUBBLES IN RCA MODELS

We validate our approach through two empirical applications, both involving (potentially) nonstationary data. In Section 6.1, we consider a “pure” RCA model with no covariates, and use it to detect daily Covid-19 hospitalisations; in Section 6.2, we consider an RCA model with covariates, and use it to detect changes in the dynamics of house prices.

**6.1. Sequential monitoring of Covid-19 hospitalisations.** We consider daily data on Covid-19 hospitalisations. There is a huge literature on the application of time series methods to the reduced form of epidemiological models; Shtatland and Shtatland (2008), *inter*

TABLE 5.4. Median delays and empirical rejection frequencies under alternatives - no covariates

DGP	$\psi$	Weighted CUSUM			Standardised CUSUM		Weighted Page-CUSUM			
		0	0.25	0.45	0.5	$\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$	0	0.25	0.45	
<b>Case I</b> ( $\beta_0=0.5$ )	$m^*$	100	54 (0.705)	44 (0.695)	35.5 (0.618)	37 (0.465)	34 (0.552)	55 (0.700)	44 (0.690)	35.5 (0.644)
		200	82 (0.821)	63 (0.822)	49 (0.769)	57 (0.633)	51 (0.704)	79 (0.818)	62 (0.819)	47 (0.779)
		400	105 (0.947)	80 (0.941)	61 (0.894)	74 (0.784)	62 (0.847)	105 (0.940)	80.5 (0.926)	59 (0.885)
		800	135 (0.964)	103 (0.952)	69 (0.923)	90 (0.843)	75.5 (0.889)	135 (0.959)	89 (0.958)	60 (0.933)
<b>Case II</b> ( $\beta_0=1.05$ )	$m^*$	100	20 (1.000)	14 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	12 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	20 (1.000)	14 (1.000)	11 (1.000)
		200	26 (1.000)	16 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	13 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	25 (1.000)	16 (1.000)	10 (1.000)
		400	29 (1.000)	18 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	13 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	30 (1.000)	18 (1.000)	11 (1.000)
		800	32 (1.000)	19 (1.000)	12 (1.000)	13 (1.000)	12 (1.000)	32 (1.000)	18 (1.000)	10 (1.000)
<b>Case III</b> ( $\beta_0=1$ )	$m^*$	100	29 (0.994)	23 (0.993)	20 (0.991)	24 (0.989)	21 (0.990)	30 (0.996)	23 (0.995)	19 (0.993)
		200	37 (1.000)	26 (1.000)	19 (1.000)	24 (1.000)	21 (1.000)	37 (1.000)	26 (1.000)	19 (1.000)
		400	42 (1.000)	29 (1.000)	20 (1.000)	25 (1.000)	21 (1.000)	42 (1.000)	29 (1.000)	20 (1.000)
		800	47 (1.000)	31 (1.000)	21 (1.000)	25 (1.000)	22 (1.000)	47 (1.000)	29 (1.000)	21 (1.000)

For each DGP, we report the *median* detection delay for only the cases where a changepoint is detected (thus leaving out the cases where no changepoint is detected). Numbers in round brackets represent the empirical rejection frequencies.

*alia*, advocate using a low-order autoregression as an approximation of the popular SIR model, especially as a methodology for the early detection of outbreaks; and Horváth et al. (2022) apply the RCA model to a similar dataset, detecting several changepoints. In this context, it is important to check whether the observations change from an explosive to a stationary regime (meaning that the epidemic is slowing down), or vice versa whether they change from a stationary to an explosive regime (corresponding to a surge in the epidemic). Our dataset consists of daily data for England recorded between March 19th, 2020, and January 30th, 2021, i.e. spanning the period from approximately the first lockdown (which

was announced on March 23rd, 2020), until after the third and last lockdown of January 6th, 2021. We transform the series into logs (plus one since on some days the number of hospitalisation is zero); no further pre-processing is applied.<sup>3</sup>

We use a “pure” RCA specification with no covariates. The purpose of our exercise is to ascertain whether public health authorities, back in 2020, could have benefited from the use of a sequential monitoring procedure to flag changes in the dynamics of daily hospitalisations, thus informing their decisions. We have used  $\psi = 1/2$  in  $g_{m,\psi}(k)$  in (2.5); based on the empirical rejection frequencies reported in Tables 5.1-5.3, we use the critical values  $\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  defined in (3.8);<sup>4</sup> in all scenarios we set the length of the monitoring horizon always equal to the training sample size, i.e.  $m = m^*$ , which, according to the results in Tables 5.1-5.3, always ensures size control.

TABLE 6.1. Online changepoint detection for Covid-19 daily hospitalisation - England data.

Changepoint 1	Changepoint 2	Changepoint 3
Aug 28th, 2020	Nov 4th, 2020	Jan 27th, 2021
$\widehat{\beta} = 0.995$ [Apr 11th, 2020 - Aug 15th, 2020]	$\widehat{\beta} = 1.010$ [Aug 29th, 2020 - Oct 29th, 2020]	$\widehat{\beta} = 1.002$ [Nov 5th, 2020 - Dec 31st, 2020]

The series ends at 30 January 2021. We use the logs of the original data (plus one, given that, in some days, hospitalisations are equal to zero): no further transformations are used.

For each changepoint, we report the left WLS estimates of  $\beta_0$  - i.e., the value of  $\beta_0$  *prior* to the breakdate; we report the sample on which estimation was performed in square brackets, based on the changepoints identified using the test by Horváth and Trapani (2023).

By way of preliminary analysis (and also to assess how our online detection methodology fares), in Section B.1 in the Supplement we apply the test by Horváth and Trapani (2023) to the whole sample (Table B.1). In particular, after the closure of the education and

<sup>3</sup>The data are available from

<https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/uk-daily-covid-admissions?tab=chart&stackMode=absolute&time=2020-03->  
See also <https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/2022-12/timeline-coronavirus-lockdown>  
for a timeline of the UK Government decisions on lockdown and closures.

<sup>4</sup>Results with different values of  $\psi$  - and with  $\psi = 1/2$  and asymptotic critical values - are available upon request.

hospitality sectors in all UK nations announced on March 23rd, 2020 (and implemented 3 days later), a changepoint is found at April 10th, 2020, indicating that the lockdown had started to “bite” after that date; subsequently, another changepoint is found towards the end of August, which can be naturally interpreted as the beginning of the second wave in the UK, after an increase in travelling during the holiday season. Hence, we use, as training sample, the period between April 11th, 2020 and August 15th, 2020, with  $m = 127$ . We find evidence of a changepoint on August 28th, 2020. As can be seen in Table B.1 in the Supplement, the ex-post test by Horváth and Trapani (2023) finds a break at August 26th. Clearly, a direct comparison between the two tests is not meaningful, since ex-post detection uses the information contained in the full sample, whereas online detection cannot make use of it - thus putting the latter at a disadvantage compared to the former. Still, there is (only) a two days delay between the two procedures. Moreover, the August changepoint was officially acknowledged by the PM on September 18th, 2020; hence, our sequential monitoring procedure could have brought forward public health decisions. The value of  $\beta$  after the break is above 1, indicating an explosive dynamics in Covid-19 hospitalisations. Table B.1 in the Supplement indicates that there was a further break on October 29th, 2020, corresponding to the lockdown at the end of that month. Hence, we restart our monitoring procedure, and we use the training sample August 29th, 2020 till October 29th, 2020, with  $m = 61$ ; under an explosive regime, this should suffice to ensure size control and short detection delay, according to the results in Tables 5.3 and 5.4. A changepoint is flagged on November 4th, 2020, with a decline in  $\beta$  indicating the effect of the closures and also of the growing concerns about a second wave. The break is detected very close to (and indeed *before*) the lockdown, suggesting that lockdowns tended to occur when a turning point in hospitalisations had already occurred, or was “in the making”. Such evidence can be read in conjunction with the results in Table B.1 in the Supplement, and also with Wood (2022), who, albeit with a different methodology and focus, finds similar results for hospital deaths.

Finally, we carry out monitoring using a training sample between November 5th, 2020, till December 31st, 2020, thus having  $m = 58$ . We find a changepoint on January 27th, 2021, i.e. two weeks later the break found with the ex-post test by Horváth and Trapani (2023), and three weeks later after the national lockdown announced on January 6th, 2021.

In conclusion, the empirical evidence presented above shows that our RCA-based approach to online changepoint detection is suitable to detect the onset (and the receding) of a pandemic with short delays, thus being a recommended item in the toolbox of public health decision-makers.

**6.2. Sequential monitoring of housing prices.** We apply our sequential detection procedures to the online detection of a change in housing prices in Los Angeles at the end of the first decade of the century. Horváth and Trapani (2023) apply an RCA-based, ex-post changepoint test, and find evidence of such a bubble starting around February 4th, 2009, when, after a period of “hard landing”, prices stabilised;<sup>5</sup> we also refer to a related paper by Horváth et al. (2022), who use monthly data. We use Los Angeles as a case study to check how timely online detection is, and also to assess the robustness of our results to the choice of the training and monitoring sample sizes, and the benefit of adding covariates. In our application, following Horváth and Trapani (2023), we use (logs of) daily housing prices.<sup>6</sup> All our monitoring exercises start at January 15th, 2009; Horváth and Trapani (2023) find no changepoints between May 4th, 2006, and February 3rd, 2009, which entails that the non-contamination assumption during the training period is satisfied in all cases considered. We monitor for changepoints using several alternative models. In addition to the basic RCA specification, with no covariates, we also use different combinations of regressors, including: two variables that are closely related to the risk-free interest rate, taking into account the opportunity cost of capital (the Moody’s Seasoned Aaa Corporate Bond Yield,

---

<sup>5</sup>See Section B.2 for a plot of the data.

<sup>6</sup>We use the daily data constructed by Bollerslev et al. (2016), and we refer to that paper for a description of the datasets.

and the 10 Year US Treasury Constant Maturity Rate); a measure of volatility (namely, the VXO volatility index); and a measure of real economic activity (we use the Lewis-Mertens-Stock Weekly Economic Indicator, WEI<sup>7</sup>). All regressors are taken from the FRED St Louis website. The risk-free interest rate proxies and the volatility measure are transformed into logs. Applying standard unit root tests to these explanatory variables, we find overwhelming evidence of a unit root in all of them during the period March 28th, 2008, corresponding to the earliest starting point for the training sample, and October 30th, 2009, corresponding to the latest ending point for the monitoring horizon (see Section B.2 in the Supplement for details); hence, we employ their first differences. As far as the WEI is concerned, it comes at a weekly frequency, and we use its weekly value for each day by way of disaggregation; other disaggregation methods could be employed following the Mixed-Data Sampling literature (MIDAS; see e.g. Ghysels, 2018), e.g. using a weighted average interpolation, but we found that these did not make virtually any difference in our results (in fact, marginally worsening the detection delay). No further pre-processing is carried out. As far as implementation is concerned, we have used  $\psi = 1/2$  in  $g_{m,\psi}^{(x)}(k)$  in (4.5); in the case considered, the data are “nearly” non-stationary during the training period, and therefore, based on Table A.3, we use the asymptotic critical values  $c_{\alpha,0.5}$ .

Results in Table 6.2 show that adding covariates can potentially lead to meaningful improvements in terms of detection delay: a measure of economic activity such as the WEI index, in particular, seems to contain relevant information to model the dynamics of house prices. We also note that detection delays seem to be around 4 months, which may be a consequence of the relatively small change in  $\beta$  before and after the change. Interestingly, results are unaffected by the size of the training sample  $m$ , but they do differ if  $m^*$  changes. This is a purely mechanical effect, due to the increase in the asymptotic critical values as  $m^*$  increases, as also noted in Section 5.

---

<sup>7</sup>See Lewis et al. (2022) for a thorough description.

TABLE 6.2. Online changepoint detection for Los Angeles daily housing prices.

Model: $y_i = (\beta_i + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2}$			Model: $y_i = (\beta_i + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \lambda_1 x_{1,i} + \lambda_2 x_{2,i} + \epsilon_{i,2}$		
$m$	$m^*$		$m$	$m^*$	
	100	200		100	200
100	Jun 9th, 2009 [no changepoint found]	Jun 15th, 2009	100	Jun 2nd, 2009	Jun 2nd, 2009
200	Jun 9th, 2009 [no changepoint found]	Jun 15th, 2009	200	Jun 3rd, 2009	Jun 10th, 2009

Model: $y_i = (\beta_i + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \lambda_1 x_{1,i} + \lambda_2 x_{2,i} + \lambda_3 x_{3,i} + \epsilon_{i,2}$			Model: $y_i = (\beta_i + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \lambda_1 x_{1,i} + \lambda_2 x_{2,i} + \lambda_3 x_{3,i} + \lambda_4 x_{4,i} + \epsilon_{i,2}$		
$m$	$m^*$		$m$	$m^*$	
	100	200		100	200
100	Jun 2nd, 2009	Jun 2nd, 2009	100	May 18th, 2009	May 18th, 2009
200	Jun 3rd, 2009	Jun 10th, 2009	200	Jun 2nd, 2009	Jun 2nd, 2009

For each combination of  $m$  and  $m^*$ , we report the estimated breakdate. For all combinations of  $m$  and  $m^*$ , monitoring starts on January 15th, 2009. When  $m = 100$ , the training sample covers the period August 20th, 2008, till January 14th, 2009; when  $m = 200$ , the training sample covers the period March 28th, 2008, till January 14th, 2009. Similarly, when  $m^* = 100$ , the monitoring horizon stops at June 9th, 2009; when  $m^* = 200$ , the monitoring horizon stops at October 30th, 2009.

We have used the following notation for the regressors:  $x_{1,i}$  denotes the 10 Year US Treasury Constant Maturity Rate,  $x_{2,i}$  denotes the Moody's Seasoned Aaa Corporate Bond Yield,  $x_{3,i}$  is the VXO volatility index, and  $x_{4,i}$  is the WEI.

Horváth and Trapani (2023) find evidence of a changepoint on February 3rd, 2009, applying ex-post changepoint detection to the period January 5th, 1995 to October 23rd, 2012. The deterministic part of the autoregressive coefficient,  $\beta$ , is found to be equal to 0.99931 in the period before the changepoint, and 1.00007 afterwards.

## 7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We propose a family of weighted CUSUM statistics for the online detection of changepoints in a Random Coefficient Autoregressive model. Our statistics are, in particular, based on the CUSUM process of the WLS residuals, and we study both the standard CUSUM, and the so-called Page-CUSUM monitoring schemes, which is designed to offer higher power/shorter detection delay. In the case of the standard CUSUM, we also study the standardised version using  $\psi = 1/2$ , obtaining, under the null, a Darling-Erdős limit theorem. In this case, seeing as the asymptotic critical values are a poor approximation leading to an overly conservative procedure, we also propose an approximation which works well in finite samples, avoiding overrejections. As our simulations show, the use of weighted

statistics is particularly beneficial under the alternative, with detection delays decreasing as  $\psi$  increases. Whilst, for the ease of exposition, we focus on the RCA case with no covariates, we also extend our theory to include exogenous regressors, which are allowed to be weakly dependent according to a very general definition of dependence. Simulations show that our procedures broadly guarantee size control; indeed, our experiments indicate that, for any given training sample size  $m$  and monitoring horizon  $m^*$ , it is always possible to choose the appropriate weighing scheme to ensure the best balance between size control and timely detection. This is reinforced by our empirical illustrations, showing that when our methodology is applied to the online detection of epidemiological and housing data, it manages to find breaks very quickly, even when compared against ex-post detection methodologies.

Importantly, building on the well-known fact that, in an RCA model, WLS inference on the deterministic part of the autoregressive parameter is always Gaussian, irrespective of whether the observations form a stationary or nonstationary sequence, our monitoring procedures can be applied to virtually any type of data: stationary, or with an explosive dynamics, or on the boundary between the two regimes, with no modifications required. Hence, our methodology is particularly suited, as a leading example, to the detection of both the onset, or the collapse, of a bubble (when using financial data), or of a pandemic (when using epidemiological data). Other cases also can be considered, e.g. monitoring for changes in the persistence of a stationary series such as inflation, and the extension of the basic RCA specification to include covariates should enhance the applicability of our methodology.

#### REFERENCES

- Akharif, A. and M. Hallin (2003). Efficient detection of random coefficients in autoregressive models. *Annals of Statistics* 31(2), 675–704.



- Anděl, J. (1976). Autoregressive series with random parameters. *Mathematische Operationsforschung und Statistik* 7(5), 735–741.
- Astill, S., A. R. Taylor, N. Kellard, and I. Korkos (2023). Using covariates to improve the efficacy of univariate bubble detection methods. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 70, 342–366.
- Aue, A., S. Hörmann, L. Horváth, and M. Hušková (2014). Dependent functional linear models with applications to monitoring structural change. *Statistica Sinica* 24(3), 1043–1073.
- Aue, A., S. Hörmann, L. Horváth, and M. Reimherr (2009). Break detection in the covariance structure of multivariate time series models. *Annals of Statistics* 37(6B), 4046–4087.
- Aue, A. and L. Horváth (2004). Delay time in sequential detection of change. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 67(3), 221–231.
- Aue, A. and L. Horváth (2011). Quasi-likelihood estimation in stationary and nonstationary autoregressive models with random coefficients. *Statistica Sinica* 21(3), 973–999.
- Aue, A., L. Horváth, P. Kokoszka, and J. Steinebach (2008). Monitoring shifts in mean: asymptotic normality of stopping times. *Test* 17, 515–530.
- Aue, A., L. Horváth, and J. Steinebach (2006). Estimation in random coefficient autoregressive models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 27(1), 61–76.
- Berkes, I., S. Hörmann, and J. Schauer (2011). Split invariance principles for stationary processes. *Annals of Probability* 39(6), 2441–2473.
- Berkes, I., L. Horváth, and S. Ling (2009). Estimation in nonstationary random coefficient autoregressive models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 30(4), 395–416.
- Bollerslev, T., A. J. Patton, and W. Wang (2016). Daily house price indices: construction, modeling, and longer-run predictions. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 31(6), 1005–1025.
- Chu, C., M. Stinchcombe, and H. White (1996). Monitoring structural change. *Econometrica* 64(5), 1045–1066.
- Csörgő, M. and L. Horváth (1993). *Weighted Approximations in Probability and Statistics*. J. Wiley & Sons.
- Csörgő, M. and L. Horváth (1997). *Limit Theorems in Change-Point Analysis*, Volume 18. John Wiley & Sons.
- Darling, D. A. and P. Erdős (1956). A limit theorem for the maximum of normalized sums of independent random variables. *Duke Mathematical Journal* 23(1), 143–155.

- Diba, B. T. and H. I. Grossman (1988). The theory of rational bubbles in stock prices. *The Economic Journal* 98(392), 746–754.
- Engle, R. F. (1982). Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation. *Econometrica* 50(4), 987–1007.
- Fan, J. and Q. Yao (2008). *Nonlinear Time Series: Nonparametric and Parametric Methods*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Fremdt, S. (2015). Page’s sequential procedure for change-point detection in time series regression. *Statistics* 49(1), 128–155.
- Garsia, A. M., E. Rodemich, H. Rumsey, and M. Rosenblatt (1970). A real variable lemma and the continuity of paths of some Gaussian processes. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* 20(6), 565–578.
- Ghysels, E. (2018). Mixed frequency models. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Economics and Finance*.
- Gombay, E. and L. Horváth (1996). On the rate of approximations for maximum likelihood tests in change-point models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 56(1), 120–152.
- Granger, C. W. and N. R. Swanson (1997). An introduction to stochastic unit-root processes. *Journal of Econometrics* 80(1), 35–62.
- Hall, P. and C. C. Heyde (2014). *Martingale Limit Theory and its Application*. Academic press.
- Harvey, D. I., S. J. Leybourne, and R. Sollis (2017). Improving the accuracy of asset price bubble start and end date estimators. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 40, 121–138.
- Homm, U. and J. Breitung (2012). Testing for speculative bubbles in stock markets: a comparison of alternative methods. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 10(1), 198–231.
- Horváth, L., M. Hušková, P. Kokoszka, and J. Steinebach (2004). Monitoring changes in linear models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 126(1), 225–251.
- Horváth, L., Z. Liu, and S. Lu (2022). Sequential monitoring of changes in dynamic linear models, applied to the us housing market. *Econometric Theory* 38(2), 209–272.
- Horváth, L. and L. Trapani (2016). Statistical inference in a random coefficient panel model. *Journal of Econometrics* 193(1), 54–75.
- Horváth, L. and L. Trapani (2019). Testing for randomness in a random coefficient autoregression model. *Journal of Econometrics* 209(2), 338–352.
- Horváth, L. and L. Trapani (2023). Change-point detection in heteroscedastic random coefficient autoregressive models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 41(4), 1300–1314.

- Horváth, L., L. Trapani, and J. VanderDoes (2022). The maximally selected likelihood ratio test in random coefficient models. *Econometrics Journal*.
- Ibragimov, I. A. (1962). Some limit theorems for stationary processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 7(4), 349–382.
- Kirch, C. and C. Stoehr (2022a). Asymptotic delay times of sequential tests based on U-statistics for early and late change points. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 221, 114–135.
- Kirch, C. and C. Stoehr (2022b). Sequential change point tests based on u-statistics. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 49(3), 1184–1214.
- Komlós, J., P. Major, and G. Tusnády (1975). An approximation of partial sums of independent R.V.'s and the sample DF.I. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* 32, 111–131.
- Komlós, J., P. Major, and G. Tusnády (1976). An approximation of partial sums of independent R.V.'s and the sample DF.II. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* 34, 33–58.
- Lewis, D. J., K. Mertens, J. H. Stock, and M. Trivedi (2022). Measuring real activity using a weekly economic index. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 37(4), 667–687.
- Li, F., Z. Tian, and P. Qi (2015). Structural change monitoring for random coefficient autoregressive time series. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation* 44(4), 996–1009.
- Li, F., Z. Tian, P. Qi, and Z. Chen (2015). Monitoring parameter changes in RCA(p) models. *Journal of the Korean Statistical Society* 44(1), 111–122.
- Liu, W. and Z. Lin (2009). Strong approximation for a class of stationary processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 119(1), 249–280.
- Na, O., J. Lee, and S. Lee (2010). Monitoring parameter changes for random coefficient autoregressive models. *Journal of the Korean Statistical Society* 39(3), 281–288.
- Nicholls, D. F. and B. G. Quinn (2012). *Random Coefficient Autoregressive Models: an Introduction*, Volume 11. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Phillips, P. C., S. Shi, and J. Yu (2015a). Testing for multiple bubbles: historical episodes of exuberance and collapse in the S&P 500. *International Economic Review* 56(4), 1043–1078.
- Phillips, P. C., S. Shi, and J. Yu (2015b). Testing for multiple bubbles: limit theory of real-time detectors. *International Economic Review* 56(4), 1079–1134.
- Phillips, P. C. and S.-P. Shi (2018). Financial bubble implosion and reverse regression. *Econometric Theory* 34(4), 705–753.

- Phillips, P. C., Y. Wu, and J. Yu (2011). Explosive behavior in the 1990s Nasdaq: when did exuberance escalate asset values? *International Economic Review* 52(1), 201–226.
- Phillips, P. C. and J. Yu (2011). Dating the timeline of financial bubbles during the subprime crisis. *Quantitative Economics* 2(3), 455–491.
- Shtatland, E. S. and T. Shtatland (2008). Another look at low-order autoregressive models in early detection of epidemic outbreaks and explosive behaviors in economic and financial time series. *SGF Proceedings* 363.
- Skrobotov, A. (2023). Testing for explosive bubbles: a review. *Dependence Modeling* 11(1), 20220152.
- Tsay, R. S. (1987). Conditional heteroscedastic time series models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 82(398), 590–604.
- Vostrikova, L. Y. (1981). Detecting disorder in multidimensional random processes. In *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, Volume 259, pp. 270–274. Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Whitehouse, E. J., D. I. Harvey, and S. J. Leybourne (2023). Real-time monitoring of bubbles and crashes. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 85(3), 482–513.
- Wood, S. N. (2022). Inferring UK Covid-19 fatal infection trajectories from daily mortality data: were infections already in decline before the UK lockdowns? *Biometrics* 78(3), 1127–1140.
- Wu, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102(40), 14150–14154.

A. FURTHER MONTE CARLO EVIDENCE AND GUIDELINES

TABLE A.1. Empirical rejection frequencies under the null of no changepoint with covariates - Case I,  $\beta_0 = 0.5$

		Weighted CUSUM			Standardised CUSUM		Weighted Page-CUSUM			
		$\psi$	0	0.25	0.45	0.5	$\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$	0	0.25	0.45
$m$	$m^*$					$c_{\alpha,0.5}$				
50	25		0.060	0.062	0.046	0.030	0.052	0.051	0.059	0.046
	50		0.068	0.078	0.071	0.037	0.066	0.068	0.067	0.066
	100		0.072	0.078	0.077	0.043	0.064	0.070	0.072	0.072
	200		0.087	0.082	0.082	0.044	0.066	0.081	0.102	0.093
100	50		0.075	0.069	0.075	0.030	0.057	0.063	0.067	0.059
	100		0.060	0.061	0.050	0.034	0.050	0.060	0.062	0.058
	200		0.075	0.085	0.078	0.026	0.057	0.074	0.088	0.078
	400		0.062	0.066	0.065	0.022	0.047	0.056	0.065	0.062
200	100		0.051	0.041	0.055	0.029	0.046	0.048	0.047	0.058
	200		0.056	0.047	0.051	0.030	0.044	0.058	0.061	0.066
	400		0.056	0.062	0.055	0.033	0.053	0.049	0.060	0.065
	800		0.054	0.064	0.056	0.025	0.042	0.049	0.059	0.057

TABLE A.2. Empirical rejection frequencies under the null of no changepoint with covariates - Case II,  $\beta_0 = 1.05$

$m$	$m^*$	$\psi$	Weighted CUSUM			Standardised CUSUM		Weighted Page-CUSUM		
			0	0.25	0.45	0.5	$\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$	0	0.25	0.45
						$c_{\alpha,0.5}$				
50	25		0.046	0.045	0.029	0.014	0.029	0.041	0.037	0.025
	50		0.070	0.073	0.046	0.016	0.041	0.063	0.061	0.041
	100		0.062	0.061	0.046	0.013	0.029	0.055	0.042	0.040
	200		0.070	0.052	0.032	0.016	0.024	0.063	0.065	0.038
100	50		0.039	0.040	0.033	0.009	0.027	0.038	0.036	0.033
	100		0.052	0.045	0.034	0.012	0.029	0.048	0.048	0.037
	200		0.048	0.046	0.037	0.011	0.023	0.042	0.047	0.036
	400		0.066	0.077	0.061	0.021	0.049	0.051	0.068	0.063
200	100		0.053	0.041	0.033	0.011	0.025	0.048	0.045	0.037
	200		0.059	0.050	0.045	0.014	0.031	0.055	0.061	0.051
	400		0.046	0.055	0.043	0.010	0.032	0.036	0.053	0.044
	800		0.046	0.053	0.038	0.008	0.018	0.039	0.045	0.034

TABLE A.3. Empirical rejection frequencies under the null of no changepoint with covariates - Case III,  $\beta_0 = 1$

$m$	$m^*$	$\psi$	Weighted CUSUM			Standardised CUSUM		Weighted Page-CUSUM		
			0	0.25	0.45	0.5	$\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$	0	0.25	0.45
						$c_{\alpha,0.5}$				
50	25		0.084	0.083	0.061	0.039	0.066	0.078	0.074	0.066
	50		0.103	0.107	0.095	0.057	0.083	0.103	0.092	0.084
	100		0.126	0.124	0.110	0.071	0.093	0.124	0.119	0.101
	200		0.139	0.132	0.121	0.074	0.106	0.136	0.143	0.125
100	50		0.083	0.077	0.063	0.036	0.056	0.075	0.070	0.060
	100		0.098	0.091	0.078	0.047	0.074	0.097	0.094	0.080
	200		0.103	0.102	0.090	0.061	0.072	0.103	0.111	0.092
	400		0.112	0.120	0.106	0.056	0.084	0.112	0.118	0.107
200	100		0.068	0.050	0.043	0.020	0.032	0.065	0.062	0.047
	200		0.098	0.087	0.082	0.041	0.070	0.092	0.098	0.092
	400		0.095	0.096	0.078	0.044	0.068	0.094	0.098	0.083
	800		0.109	0.114	0.091	0.056	0.073	0.103	0.106	0.100

TABLE A.4. Median delays and empirical rejection frequencies under alternatives - DGP with covariates

DGP	$\psi$	Weighted CUSUM			Standardised CUSUM		Weighted Page-CUSUM			
		0	0.25	0.45	0.5	$\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$	0	0.25	0.45	
<b>Case I</b> ( $\beta_0=0.5$ )	$m^*$	100	52 (0.704)	45 (0.671)	34 (0.622)	36 (0.473)	31 (0.553)	55 (0.704)	45.5 (0.699)	31 (0.656)
		200	80 (0.849)	61.5 (0.833)	47 (0.792)	52 (0.662)	46 (0.743)	81 (0.848)	59 (0.846)	43.5 (0.809)
		400	108.5 (0.915)	79 (0.911)	60 (0.880)	71.5 (0.759)	58 (0.834)	109 (0.909)	78 (0.912)	57 (0.881)
		800	135 (0.972)	94 (0.970)	75 (0.942)	94 (0.846)	81 (0.898)	136 (0.967)	95 (0.962)	70 (0.940)
<b>Case II</b> ( $\beta_0=1.05$ )	$m^*$	100	15 (1.000)	13 (1.000)	9 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	9 (1.000)	19 (1.000)	13 (1.000)	9 (1.000)
		200	24 (1.000)	15 (1.000)	9 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	9 (1.000)	25 (1.000)	15 (1.000)	9 (1.000)
		400	27 (1.000)	16 (1.000)	10 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	9 (1.000)	28 (1.000)	16 (1.000)	10 (1.000)
		800	30 (1.000)	17 (1.000)	10 (1.000)	11 (1.000)	9 (1.000)	31 (1.000)	17 (1.000)	9 (1.000)
<b>Case III</b> ( $\beta_0=1$ )	$m^*$	100	27 (0.997)	22 (0.996)	18 (0.995)	22 (0.992)	18 (0.994)	29 (0.998)	22 (0.997)	18 (0.997)
		200	34 (1.000)	25 (1.000)	19 (1.000)	22 (1.000)	18 (1.000)	35 (1.000)	24 (1.000)	18 (1.000)
		400	39 (1.000)	26 (1.000)	19 (1.000)	22 (1.000)	18 (1.000)	40 (1.000)	26 (1.000)	18 (1.000)
		800	45 (1.000)	27 (1.000)	18 (1.000)	23 (1.000)	19 (1.000)	46 (1.000)	29 (1.000)	18 (1.000)


For each DGP, we report the *mean* detection delay for only the cases where a changepoint is detected (thus leaving out the cases where no changepoint is detected). Numbers in round brackets represent the empirical rejection frequencies. We do not report median delays, unlike in Table 5.4. All medians are around zero.



## B. FURTHER EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

**B.1. Further empirical evidence on UK Covid-19 hospitalisation data .** We report a graph of the logs of (one plus) the daily hospitalisation data with the identified changepoints in Figure B.1.

Figure B.1. Daily Covid-19 hospitalisations - with changepoints - for England.



We have conducted, by way of comparison, an ex-post changepoint detection exercise, applying the techniques developed in Horváth and Trapani (2023) to the whole sample. We only report results obtained using Rényi statistics (corresponding to using a weighted version of the CUSUM process with weights  $\kappa = 0.51, 0.55, 0.65, 0.75, 0.85$  and 1 - see Horváth and Trapani, 2023 for details).<sup>8</sup> As far as breakdates are concerned, we pick

<sup>8</sup>Using other weighing schemes give very similar results, available upon request.

the ones corresponding to the “majority vote” across  $\kappa$ , although discrepancies are, when present, in the region of few days (2 – 5 at most). We use binary segmentation, as also discussed in Horváth and Trapani (2023), to detect multiple breaks.

TABLE B.1. Ex-post changepoint detection for Covid-19 daily hospitalisation - England data.

Changepoint 1	Changepoint 2	Changepoint 3	Changepoint 4
Apr 10th, 2020 [1.009]	Aug 26th, 2020 [0.994]	Oct 29th, 2020 [1.010]	Jan 12th, 2021 [1.002]

The series ends at 30 January 2021. We use the logs of the original data (plus one, given that, in some days, hospitalisations are equal to zero): no further transformations are used.

All changepoints have been detected by all Rényi-type tests - no discrepancies were noted. Detected changepoints, and their estimated date, are presented in *chronological* order; breakdates have been estimated as the points in time where the majority of tests identifies a changepoint. Whilst details are available upon request, we note that breaks were detected with this order (from the first to be detected to the last one): break in August; break in April; break in January 2021; break in October.

For each changepoint, we report in square brackets, for reference, the left WLS estimates of  $\beta_0$  - i.e., the value of  $\beta_0$  *prior* to the breakdate.

**B.2. Further empirical evidence on housing data.** We report some preliminary information on our data. In Table B.2, we report the outcome of a standard unit root test on the three covariates used in our exercise.


TABLE B.2. Unit root tests applied to covariates

Variable	Period	$t$ -ADF	Notes
AAA	Mar 28th, 2008 - Oct 30th, 2009	-1.387 [0.863]	Daily frequency; trend and intercept used in ADF
GS10	Mar 28th, 2008 - Oct 30th, 2009	-1.463 [0.840]	Daily frequency; trend and intercept used in ADF
VXO	Mar 28th, 2008 - Oct 30th, 2009	-2.682 [0.244]	Daily frequency; trend and intercept used in ADF
WEI	Jan 5th, 2008 - Dec 26th, 2009	3.070 [1.000]	Weekly frequency; trend and intercept used in ADF

For each series, we have carried out a standard ADF test, choosing the number of lags in the Dickey-Fuller regression based on BIC. The numbers in square brackets are the p-values.

In Figure B.2, we plot housing prices in Los Angeles between March 28th, 2008, and October 30th, 2009.

Figure B.2. Logs of daily housing prices in Los Angeles - with estimated changepoint.



### C. PRELIMINARY LEMMAS

We will use the following facts and notation: “ $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}}$ ” denotes convergence in distribution; “ $\stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=}$ ” denotes equality in distribution;  $c_1, c_2, \dots$  denote positive, finite constants which do not depend on sample sizes, and whose values may change from line to line.

Recall (2.1) under  $H_0$

$$y_i = (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i,1}) y_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2}.$$

If  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , define the stationary solution

$$(C.1) \quad \bar{y}_i = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}) \right) \epsilon_{i-\ell,2},$$

with the convention that  $\prod_{\emptyset} = 0$ . Finally, let

$$(C.2) \quad a_3 = E \left( \frac{\bar{y}_0^2}{1 + \bar{y}_0^2} \right).$$

**Lemma C.1.** *We assume that Assumption 2.1 is satisfied. Under  $H_0$ , it holds that*

(i) *if  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , then*

$$(C.3) \quad \left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) - \frac{1}{m a_3} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \right| = O_P \left( \frac{1}{m} \right),$$

$$(C.4) \quad \left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) - \frac{1}{m a_3} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \right| = O_P \left( \frac{1}{m} \right);$$

(ii) *if either  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| = 0$  and Assumption 3.1 holds, or  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$  and Assumption 3.2 holds, then*

$$(C.5) \quad \left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \epsilon_{i,1} \right| = O_P (m^{-1/2-\zeta}),$$

$$(C.6) \quad \left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right) \right| = O_P(m^{-1/2-\zeta}),$$

for some  $\zeta > 0$ .

*Proof.* We begin by showing (C.3)-(C.4). Under  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , Aue et al. (2006) show that there exist a  $\kappa > 0$  and a  $0 < c < 1$  such that

$$E |y_i - \bar{y}_i|^\kappa = O(c^i),$$

as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, by elementary algebra

$$\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} |\epsilon_{i,1}| \left| \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1+\bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} |\epsilon_{i,1}| |y_{i-1}^2 - \bar{y}_{i-1}^2| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} |\epsilon_{i,1}| |y_{i-1} - \bar{y}_{i-1}| (|y_{i-1}| + |\bar{y}_{i-1}|).$$

Since we can assume that  $\kappa < 1$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left( \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} |\epsilon_{i,1}| \left| \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1+\bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| \right)^{\kappa/2} \\ & \leq \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \left( E |\epsilon_{i,1}|^{\kappa/2} \right) E \left( |y_{i-1} - \bar{y}_{i-1}|^{\kappa/2} (|y_{i-1}| + |\bar{y}_{i-1}|)^{\kappa/2} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \left( E |\epsilon_{i,1}|^{\kappa/2} \right) (E |y_{i-1} - \bar{y}_{i-1}|^\kappa)^{1/2} (E |y_{i-1}|^\kappa + E |\bar{y}_{i-1}|^\kappa)^{1/2} \\ & < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

having used Assumption 2.1. Hence by Markov's inequality it follows that

$$(C.7) \quad \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} |\epsilon_{i,1}| \left| \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1+\bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(1),$$

and by the same logic it also follows that

$$\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \left| \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1+\bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(1).$$

By Lemmas D.1-D.4 in Horváth and Trapani (2023), the sequence  $\bar{y}_{i-1}^2 / (1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2)$  is a decomposable Bernoulli shift with all moments; hence, by Proposition 4.1 in Berkes et al. (2011) it follows that

$$\left| \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - ma_3 \right| = O_P(m^{1/2}),$$

where  $a_3$  is defined in (C.2), and similarly

$$\left| \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(m^{1/2}).$$

Equation (C.3) now follows; (C.4) follows also from exactly the same logic.

We now turn to showing (C.5) and (C.6). When  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| = 0$ , Lemma A.4 in Horváth and Trapani (2016) implies that

$$(C.8) \quad P \{ |y_i| \leq i^{\bar{\kappa}} \} \leq ci^{-\bar{\kappa}},$$

when  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$ , Berkes et al. (2009) show that  $|y_i| \rightarrow \infty$  a.s. exponentially fast, which implies (C.8). Hence by (C.8) it follows that

$$\sum_{i=2}^m E \left| \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - 1 \right| = \sum_{i=2}^m E \left| \frac{1}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right| I(|y_i| \leq i^{\bar{\kappa}}) + \sum_{i=2}^m E \left| \frac{1}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right| I(|y_i| > i^{\bar{\kappa}}) = O(m^{1-\bar{\kappa}}).$$

By the independence between  $\epsilon_{i,1}$  and  $y_{i-1}$  and by Assumption 2.1, it follows that

$$E \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \epsilon_{i,1} \left( \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - 1 \right) \right)^2 = \sum_{i=2}^m E \epsilon_{i,1}^2 E \left( \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - 1 \right)^2 = O(m^{1-\bar{\kappa}}),$$

and similarly

$$E \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^2 = O(m^{1-\bar{\kappa}}).$$

The proof of (C.5) and (C.6) is now complete.  $\square$

Consider now the decomposition

$$(C.9) \quad Z_m(k) = \left| \left( \beta_0 - \widehat{\beta}_m \right) \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right|,$$

where  $\widehat{\beta}_m$  is the WLS estimator computed using  $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ .

In the next lemma, we obtain asymptotic representations for the terms in (C.9).

**Lemma C.2.** *We assume that Assumption 2.1 is satisfied. Under  $H_0$ :*

(i) *if  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , then*

$$(C.10) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2-\eta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - k a_3 \right| = O_P(1),$$

$$(C.11) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(1),$$

$$(C.12) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(1),$$

for all  $\eta > 0$ ;

(ii) *if either  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| = 0$  and Assumption 3.1 holds, or  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$  and Assumption 3.2 holds, then*

$$(C.13) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - k \right| = O_P(m^{-\zeta}),$$

$$(C.14) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2-\eta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} \right| = O_P(m^{-\zeta}),$$

$$(C.15) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2-\eta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(m^{-\zeta}),$$

for some  $\zeta > 0$  and for all  $\eta > 0$ .

*Proof.* We begin by considering the stationary case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ . On account of the proof of Lemma C.1, (C.10) follows if we show

$$\max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2-\eta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - ka_3 \right| = O_P(1).$$

This follows immediately, since  $\bar{y}_{i-1}^2 / (1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2)$  is a decomposable Bernoulli shift with all moments, and the result is implied by the strong approximation in Aue et al. (2014).

Further, (C.11) follows immediately from (C.7); (C.12) can be shown by the same logic.

Consider now the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$ . By (C.8)

$$E \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} = O(m^{-\hat{\kappa}}),$$

for all  $\hat{\kappa} < \bar{\kappa}$ . Hence, Abel's summation formula yields

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{1}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} = \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{1}{i} \frac{1}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k-1} ((i+1) - i) \left( \sum_{j=m+1}^i \frac{1}{j} \frac{1}{1 + y_{j-1}^2} \right).$$

Given that

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k-1} E \left( \sum_{j=m+1}^i \frac{1}{j} \frac{1}{1 + y_{j-1}^2} \right) \leq E \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j} \frac{1}{1 + y_{j-1}^2} = O(m^{-\hat{\kappa}}),$$

(C.13) follows from Markov's inequality. Letting  $\mathcal{F}_i$  be the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\{(\epsilon_{j,1}, \epsilon_{j,2}), j \leq i\}$ ,

note that

$$E \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \right) = 0,$$

and therefore the sequence  $\epsilon_{i,1} / (1 + y_{i-1}^2)$  is a martingale difference sequence. Also, using the Burkholder's inequality (see e.g. Theorem 2.10 in Hall and Heyde, 2014) and (C.8)

$$(C.16) \quad E \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} E \left[ \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \right] \right|^\nu$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq c_1 E \left( \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} E \left( \frac{1}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right)^2 \right)^{\nu/2} \leq c_2 k^{\nu/2-1} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \left( E \left( \frac{1}{(1+y_{i-1}^2)^\nu} \right) \right) \\
&\leq c_2 k^{\nu/2-1} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \left( E \left( \frac{1}{(1+y_{i-1}^2)^\nu} I(|y_i| \leq i^{\bar{\kappa}}) \right) + E \left( \frac{1}{(1+y_{i-1}^2)^\nu} I(|y_i| > i^{\bar{\kappa}}) \right) \right) \\
&\leq k^{\nu/2-1} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} (c_3 i^{-\bar{\kappa}} + c_4 i^{-2\nu\bar{\kappa}}) \leq c_5 \frac{k^{\nu/2}}{m^{\bar{\kappa}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$(C.17) \quad \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} E \left| \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right|^\nu \leq c_6 \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} E \left| \frac{1}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right|^\nu \leq c_7 \frac{k}{m^{\bar{\kappa}}}.$$

Using (C.16) and (C.17), and Rosenthal's maximal inequality for martingale difference sequences (see e.g. Theorem 2.12 in Hall and Heyde, 2014), it follows that

$$(C.18) \quad E \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+j} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right|^\nu \leq c_8 \frac{k^{\nu/2}}{m^{\bar{\kappa}}}.$$

We now show (C.14) by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
&P \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2-\eta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right| > x \right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} P \left\{ \max_{\exp(\ell) \leq k \leq \exp(\ell+1)} k^{-1/2-\eta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right| > x \right\} \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} P \left\{ \max_{\exp(\ell) \leq k \leq \exp(\ell+1)} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right| > x \exp \left( \ell \left( \frac{1}{2} + \eta \right) \right) \right\} \\
&\leq c_9 x^{-\nu} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \exp \left( -\nu \ell \left( \frac{1}{2} + \eta \right) \right) E \max_{1 \leq k \leq \exp(\ell+1)} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right|^\nu \\
&\leq c_{10} x^{-\nu} m^{-\bar{\kappa}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \exp \left( -\nu \ell \left( \frac{1}{2} + \eta \right) + \frac{\nu}{2} (\ell + 1) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

whence (C.14) follows immediately with  $\zeta = \bar{\kappa}$ . Equation (C.15) can be shown using the same logic.  $\square$

**Lemma C.3.** *We assume that Assumption 2.1 is satisfied. Under  $H_0$*

(i) *if  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , then we can define two independent standard Wiener processes  $\{W_{m,1}(k), 1 \leq k \leq m\}$  and  $\{W_{m,2}(k), 1 \leq k < \infty\}$ , whose distribution does not depend on  $m$ , such that*

$$(C.19) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < m} k^{-1/2+\zeta} \left| \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) - \delta^{1/2} W_{m,1}(k) \right|$$

$$= O_P(1),$$

$$(C.20) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2+\zeta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) - \delta^{1/2} W_{m,2}(k) \right|$$

$$= O_P(1),$$

for some  $\zeta > 0$ ;

(ii) *if either  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| = 0$  and Assumption 3.1 holds, or  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$  and Assumption 3.2 holds, then*

$$(C.21) \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq m} k^{-1/2+\zeta} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon_{i,1} - \sigma_1 W_{m,1}(k) \right| = O_P(1),$$

$$(C.22) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2+\zeta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} - \sigma_2 W_{m,2}(k) \right| = O_P(1),$$

for some  $\zeta > 0$ .

*Proof.* Horváth and Trapani (2023) show that  $(\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2 + \epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}) / (1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2)$  is a decomposable Bernoulli shift under  $-\infty \leq E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ . Hence, the strong approximation shown in Aue et al. (2014) immediately yields (C.19) and (C.20). Equations (C.21) and (C.22) follow directly from Komlós et al. (1975) and Komlós et al. (1976).  $\square$

Let

$$(C.23) \quad \Gamma_m(k) = \begin{cases} \delta^{1/2} |W_{m,2}(k) - kW_{m,1}(m)| & \text{if } E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0 \text{ holds,} \\ \sigma_1 |W_{m,2}(k) - kW_{m,1}(m)| & \text{if } E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0 \text{ holds.} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma C.4.** *Let  $\beta_m$  be a sequence such that, as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\gamma_m \rightarrow \infty$  with  $\gamma_m = o(m)$ .*

*Then, if assumptions of Theorem 3.4 are satisfied, it holds that under  $H_0$*

$$\max_{\gamma_m \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{|Z_m(k) - \Gamma_m(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} = O_P\left(\beta_m^{\zeta-1/2}\right),$$

for some  $0 < \zeta < 1/2$ .

*Proof.* Upon following the proof of (D.1), it can be shown that there exists a  $0 < \zeta < 1/2$  such that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \left(k^\zeta + \frac{k}{m} m^\zeta\right)^{-1} |Z_m(k) - \Gamma_m(k)| = O_P(1).$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\gamma_m \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{|Z_m(k) - \Gamma_m(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \\ &= O_P(1) \max_{\gamma_m \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{k^\zeta + \frac{k}{m} m^\zeta}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \\ &= O_P\left(\gamma_m^{\zeta-1/2}\right) + O_P\left(m^{\zeta-1/2}\right) = O_P\left(\gamma_m^{\zeta-1/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma C.5.** *We assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.4 hold. Let*

$$\gamma_{m^*} = O\left(\exp\left(\log(m^*)^{1-\epsilon}\right)\right),$$

with  $\epsilon > 0$  and arbitrarily small. Then, under  $H_0$ , on a suitably enlarged space, it is possible to construct two independent Wiener processes  $\{W_{m,1}(k), 1 \leq k \leq T_m\}$  and  $\{W_{m,2}(k), 1 \leq k \leq m\}$  whose distribution does not depend on  $m$ , such that

$$\max_{\gamma_{m^*} \leq k \leq m^*} \left| \frac{|Z_m(k)|}{g_{m,0.5}(k)} - \frac{\left| W_{m,2}(k) - \frac{k}{m} W_{m,1}(m) \right|}{g_{m,0.5}(k)} \right| = O_P \left( \exp \left( -c_0 \log(m^*)^{1-\epsilon} \right) \right),$$

for some  $0 < c_0 < 1/2$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows from the same arguments as Lemma C.4, of which this lemma is a special case.  $\square$

We now report some preliminary results to prove the main results in Section 4. We begin by studying the WLS estimator  $\widehat{\beta}_m$ . Define

$$\mathbf{Q}_m = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 & \mathbf{x}_2^\top \\ y_2 & \mathbf{x}_3^\top \\ \cdot & \cdot \\ y_{m-1} & \mathbf{x}_m^\top \end{bmatrix},$$

and the diagonal matrix

$$\mathbf{W}_m = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{1+y_1^2}, \frac{1}{1+y_2^2}, \dots, \frac{1}{1+y_{m-1}^2} \right\}.$$

Then it holds that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m = (\mathbf{Q}_m^\top \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{Q}_m)^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_m^\top \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{Y}_m,$$

where  $\mathbf{Y}_m = (y_2, y_3, \dots, y_m)^\top$ . Using the recursion defined in (4.1), we obtain

$$\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m - \mathbf{b}_0 = (\mathbf{Q}_m^\top \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{Q}_m)^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_m^\top \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{E}_m,$$

having defined  $\mathbf{b}_0 = (\beta_0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0^\top)^\top$  and

$$\mathbf{E}_m = (\epsilon_{1,2}y_1 + \epsilon_{2,2}, \epsilon_{1,3}y_2 + \epsilon_{2,3}, \dots, \epsilon_{1,m}y_{m-1} + \epsilon_{2,m})^\top.$$

Based on the above, under the condition for stationarity  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , it can be verified that

$$\bar{y}_i = (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i,1})\bar{y}_{i-1} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0^\top \mathbf{x}_i + \epsilon_{i,2}, \quad -\infty < i < \infty,$$

has a unique stationary, causal solution. Consider the variables

$$(C.24) \quad \mathbf{z}_i = \frac{1}{(1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2)^{1/2}} (\bar{y}_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i^\top)^\top,$$

$$(C.25) \quad \boldsymbol{\eta}_i = \left( \frac{(\epsilon_{i,1}\bar{y}_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2})\bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}, \frac{(\epsilon_{i,1}\bar{y}_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2})\mathbf{x}_i^\top}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right)^\top,$$

and define

$$(C.26) \quad \mathbf{Q} = E(\mathbf{z}_1 \mathbf{z}_1^\top),$$

$$(C.27) \quad \mathbf{C} = E(\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 \boldsymbol{\eta}_0^\top),$$

and

$$(C.28) \quad \mathbf{a} = E\left(\frac{(\bar{y}_1, \mathbf{x}_2^\top)^\top \bar{y}_1}{1 + \bar{y}_1^2}\right).$$

**Lemma C.6.** *We assume that  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , and that Assumptions 2.1, 4.1 and 4.2 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_m - \mathbf{b}_0 = \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \sum_{i=2}^m \boldsymbol{\eta}_i + o_P(m^{-1/2-\zeta}),$$

for some  $\zeta > 0$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$  are defined in (C.25) and (C.26).

*Proof.* We begin by writing explicitly the solution of (4.1) as

$$(C.29) \quad \bar{y}_i = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}) \right) (\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}),$$

with the convention that  $\prod_{\emptyset} = 0$ . With minor modifications of the arguments in Aue et al. (2006), it can be shown that there exist a  $\kappa > 0$  and a constant  $0 < c < 1$  such that

$$(C.30) \quad E |y_i - \bar{y}_i|^{\kappa} = O(c^i),$$

as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Using (C.30) it can be shown that

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_m^{\top} \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{Q}_m - \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_m\| = O_P(1),$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_m = \sum_{i=2}^m \bar{\mathbf{z}}_i \bar{\mathbf{z}}_i^{\top},$$

and  $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_i$  is constructed in the same way as  $\mathbf{z}_i$  defined in (C.24), replacing  $y_i$  with  $\bar{y}_i$ . We now show that  $\bar{y}_i$  defined in (C.29) is a decomposable Bernoulli shift. Indeed, let

$$\bar{y}_{i,k} = \sum_{\ell=0}^k \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}) \right) (\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}) + \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}^*) \right) (\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell,k}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}^*),$$

where for  $\ell \geq 0$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell,k} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{g}(\eta_{i-\ell}, \eta_{i-\ell-1}, \dots, \eta_k, \eta_{k-1}^*, \eta_{k-2}^*, \dots) & \text{if } \ell < i - k, \\ \mathbf{g}(\eta_{i-\ell}^*, \eta_{i-\ell-1}^*, \dots) & \text{if } \ell \geq i - k, \end{cases}$$

the  $\eta_j^*$ s are independent copies of  $\eta_0$ ,  $(\epsilon_{j,1}^*, \epsilon_{j,2}^*)$  are independent copies of  $(\epsilon_{0,1}, \epsilon_{0,2})$ , and the sequences  $\{\eta_j, -\infty < j < \infty\}$ ,  $\{\eta_j^*, -\infty < j < \infty\}$ ,  $\{(\epsilon_{j,1}, \epsilon_{j,2}), -\infty < j < \infty\}$  and  $\{(\epsilon_{j,1}^*, \epsilon_{j,2}^*), -\infty < j < \infty\}$  are independent. Defining  $u_{i-\ell} = \mathbf{x}_{i-\ell}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}$ , and recalling Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2, by the same arguments as in Aue et al. (2006) we can show that, under

$E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , there exists a  $\kappa > 0$  such that

$$E |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}|^\kappa < 1.$$

Using  $\kappa < 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left| \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}) \right) (\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}) \right|^{\kappa/2} \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} E \left( \left| \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}) \right|^{\kappa/2} |\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}|^{\kappa/2} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} \left( E \left| \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}) \right|^{\kappa} \right)^{1/2} (E |\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}|^\kappa)^{1/2} \\ & = \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} (E |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}|^\kappa)^{\ell/2} (E |\mathbf{x}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{0,2}|^\kappa)^{1/2} \\ & \leq c_1 \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} \rho^{\ell/2} \leq c_2 c_3^k, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho = E |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}|^\kappa$ , and  $0 < c_3 < 1$ , having used Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2. By the same token, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left| \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}^*) \right) (\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell,k}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}^*) \right|^{\kappa/2} \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} E \left( \left| \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}^*) \right|^{\kappa/2} |\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell,k}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}^*|^{\kappa/2} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} \left( E \left| \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\beta_0 + \epsilon_{i-j,1}^*) \right|^{\kappa} \right)^{1/2} (E |\mathbf{x}_{i-\ell,k}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{i-\ell,2}^*|^\kappa)^{1/2} \\ & = \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{\infty} (E |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}|^\kappa)^{\ell/2} (E |\mathbf{x}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 + \epsilon_{0,2}|^\kappa)^{1/2} \leq c_4 c_5^k, \end{aligned}$$

with  $0 < c_5 < 1$ . Hence it holds that

$$(C.31) \quad E |\bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_{i,k}|^k \leq c_6 c_7^k,$$

for some  $c_6 > 0$  and  $0 < c_7 < 1$ , which shows that  $\bar{y}_i$  is a decomposable Bernoulli shift.

This immediately yields, by the approximations developed in Aue et al. (2014), that

$$(C.32) \quad \left\| \frac{1}{m} \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_m - \mathbf{Q} \right\| = O_P(m^{-1/2}).$$

We now turn to studying the numerator of  $\hat{\beta}_m - \beta_0$ . We begin with some preliminary results. Using (C.31), it follows that, for all  $\kappa_3 > 0$  and for  $c_7 < c_9 < 1$

$$(C.33) \quad \begin{aligned} & E \left| \frac{\bar{y}_i^2}{1 + \bar{y}_i^2} - \frac{\bar{y}_{i,k}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i,k}^2} \right| \\ & \leq E \left| \frac{|\bar{y}_i| + |\bar{y}_{i,k}|}{(1 + \bar{y}_i^2)(1 + \bar{y}_{i,k}^2)} |\bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_{i,k}| \right|^{\kappa_3} \\ & \leq E (c_8 |\bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_{i,k}| I(|\bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_{i,k}| \leq c_9^k) + c_{10} I(|\bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_{i,k}| \geq c_9^k))^{\kappa_3} \\ & \leq c_{11} c_9^{k\kappa_3} + c_{12} P(|\bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_{i,k}| \geq c_9^k) \leq c_{11} c_9^{k\kappa_3} + c_{12} c_9^{-k} E |\bar{y}_i - \bar{y}_{i,k}| \\ & \leq c_{13} c_{14}^k, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $0 < c_9 < 1$ . Using the same arguments, for all  $\kappa_4 < \kappa_1$

$$(C.34) \quad E \left\| \frac{\mathbf{x}_i \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_{i,k} \bar{y}_{i-1,k}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1,k}^2} \right\|^{\kappa_4} \leq c_{15} c_{16}^k,$$

and for all  $\kappa_5 < \kappa_2/2$

$$(C.35) \quad E \left\| \frac{\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_{i,k} \mathbf{x}_{i,k}^\top}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1,k}^2} \right\|^{\kappa_5} \leq c_{17} c_{18}^k,$$



where  $0 < c_{16}, c_{18} < 1$ . This entails that all the sequences studied above are decomposable Benrnoulli shifts. Thus

$$\left\| \mathbf{Q}_m^\top \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{E}_m - \bar{\mathbf{E}}_m \right\| = O_P(1),$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{E}}_m = \sum_{i=2}^m \boldsymbol{\eta}_i,$$

and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$  is defined in (C.25). Repeating the arguments above, it can also be shown that, for all  $\kappa_6 < \kappa_1$

$$E \left\| \boldsymbol{\eta}_i - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,k} \right\|^{\kappa_6} \leq c_{19} c_{20}^k,$$

with  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,k}$  defined as the other coupling constructions above and  $0 < c_{20} < 1$ . The final results now follows from the strong approximation derived in Aue et al. (2014).  $\square$

**Lemma C.7.** *We assume that  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , and that Assumptions 2.1, 4.1 and 4.2 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$(C.36) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2-\eta} \left\| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} (y_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i^\top) \frac{y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - k \mathbf{a} \right\| = O_P(1),$$

for all  $\eta > 0$ , and

$$(C.37) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{(\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2}) y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{(\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2}) \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(1).$$

*Proof.* The proof is based on the results derived in the proof of Lemma C.6. Equation (C.36) follows from exactly the same argumens as the proof of (C.10), and (C.37) follows from the proof of (C.11)-(C.12).  $\square$

**Lemma C.8.** *We assume that  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ , and that Assumptions 2.1, 4.1 and 4.2 are satisfied. Then, on a suitably enlarged probability space, it is possible to define two independent Wiener processes  $\{W_{m,1}(k), 1 \leq k \leq m\}$  and  $\{W_{m,2}(k), 1 \leq k < \infty\}$ , whose*

distributions do not depend on  $m$ , such that

$$\left| \sum_{i=2}^m \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i - \mathfrak{s}_{x,1} W_{m,1}(m) \right| = O_P(m^{1/2-\zeta}),$$

and

$$\max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{1}{k^{1/2-\zeta}} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{(\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2}) \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - \mathfrak{s}_{x,2} W_{m,2}(k) \right| = O_P(1),$$

for some  $0 < \zeta < 1/2$ , where  $\mathfrak{s}_{x,1}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}_{x,2}$  are defined in (4.7).

*Proof.* In the proof of Lemma C.6 we have shown that  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$  is a decomposable Bernoulli shift; the desired result follows from Aue et al. (2014).  $\square$

**Lemma C.9.** *We assume that  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$ , and that Assumptions 2.1, 4.1-4.3 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m - \mathbf{b}_0 \right\| = O_P(m^{-1/2}).$$

*Proof.* Recall that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m - \mathbf{b}_0 = (\mathbf{Q}_m^\top \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{Q}_m)^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_m^\top \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{E}_m.$$

Repeating the proof of Theorem 3.1 in Berkes et al. (2009), it follows that  $|y_i| \rightarrow \infty$  a.s. exponentially fast; this immediately yields

$$\left\| \mathbf{Q}_m^\top \mathbf{W}_m \mathbf{Q}_m - \mathbf{B}_m \right\| = O_P(1),$$

where  $\mathbf{B}_m$  is a  $(p+1) \times (p+1)$  symmetric matrix with elements  $\{B_{i,j}, 1 \leq i, j \leq p+1\}$  defined as

$$B_{1,1} = m,$$

$$(B_{1,2}, \dots, B_{1,p+1}) = \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{x}_i^\top y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2},$$

$$\{B_{i,j}, 2 \leq i, j \leq p+1\} = \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^{\top}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2}.$$

Since we already know from the above that  $\|\mathbf{E}_m\| = O_P(m^{1/2})$ , the result follows immediately. □

## D. PROOFS

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Recall (C.23). We begin by showing that

$$(D.1) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{|Z_m(k) - \Gamma_m(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} = o_P(1).$$

We begin by considering the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ ; we write

$$\begin{aligned} & (\beta_0 - \widehat{\beta}_m) \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \frac{k}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \\ &= (\beta_0 - \widehat{\beta}_m) \left( \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - ka_3 \right) \\ & \quad - ka_3 \left( \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} - \frac{1}{ma_3} \right) \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{k}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \epsilon_{i,1} \left( \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) + \epsilon_{i,2} \left( \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - \frac{y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) \right) \\ &= R_{m,1}(k) + R_{m,2}(k) + R_{m,3}(k). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemmas C.1 and C.2 with  $\eta < 1/2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{|R_{m,1}(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\ &= O_P(m^{-1}) \max_{1 \leq k \leq M} \frac{k^{1/2+\eta}}{\left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\ & \quad + O_P(m^{-1}) \max_{M < k < \infty} \frac{k^{1/2+\eta}}{\left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\ &= O_P(1) \left( m^{-1/2} \max_{1 \leq k \leq M} k^\eta + \max_{M < k < \infty} k^{\eta-1/2} \right) = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Using the same logic, it can also be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{|R_{m,2}(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} &= o_P(1), \\ \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{|R_{m,3}(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} &= o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma C.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(D.2)} \quad & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\left| \frac{k}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) - \frac{k}{m} (a_1 \sigma_1^2 + a_2 \sigma_2^2)^{1/2} W_{m,1}(m) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\ &= o_P(1) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{k}{m} \frac{m^{1/2-\zeta}}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\ &= o_P(m^{-\zeta}) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1-\psi} = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

By the same token, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(D.3)} \quad & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \left( \epsilon_{i,1} \left( \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) \right) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\ &= o_P(1) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{1}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\ &= o_P(m^{-1/2}) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{m}{m+k} \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{-\psi} = o_P(m^{-1/2+\psi}) = o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(D.4) \quad & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \left( \epsilon_{i,2} \left( \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - \frac{y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) \right) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{m} \right) \left( \frac{k}{m+k} \right)^\psi} \\
& = O_P(1) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{1}{m^{1/2} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{m} \right) \left( \frac{k}{m+k} \right)^\psi} \\
& = O_P(m^{-1/2}) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{m}{m+k} \left( \frac{k}{m+k} \right)^{-\psi} = O_P(m^{-1/2+\psi}) = o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

having used Lemma C.2. Similarly, by Lemma C.3

$$\begin{aligned}
(D.5) \quad & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2 + \epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) - (a_1 \sigma_1^2 + a_2 \sigma_2^2)^{1/2} W_{m,2}(k) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{m} \right) \left( \frac{k}{m+k} \right)^\psi} \\
& = O_P(1) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{k^{1/2-\zeta}}{m^{1/2} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{m} \right) \left( \frac{k}{m+k} \right)^\psi} = o_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Putting all together, (D.1) has been shown for the stationary case. Considering now the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$ , write

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\beta_0 - \widehat{\beta}_m) \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \frac{k}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \epsilon_{i,1} \\
& = (\beta_0 - \widehat{\beta}_m) \left( \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - k \right) \\
& \quad - k \left( \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} - \frac{1}{m} \right) \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) \right) \\
& \quad - \frac{k}{m} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$=R_{m,4}(k) + R_{m,5}(k) + R_{m,6}(k).$$

The arguments are similar to the above. Indeed, using Lemmas C.1-C.3

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(D.6)} \quad & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{|R_{m,4}(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\
& = O_P(m^{-1/2}) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{km^{-\zeta}}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\
& = O_P(m^{-\zeta}) = o_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly it can be shown that

$$\text{(D.7)} \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{|R_{m,5}(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} = O_P(m^{-\zeta}) = o_P(1),$$

$$\text{(D.8)} \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{|R_{m,6}(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} = O_P(m^{-\zeta+\eta}) = o_P(1),$$

having chosen  $\eta < \zeta$  in the last equation. Lemma C.3 yields

$$\text{(D.9)} \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\left| \frac{k}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \epsilon_{i,1} - \sigma_1 \frac{k}{m} W_{m,1}(m) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} = O_P(m^{\zeta-1/2}) = o_P(1),$$

and

$$\text{(D.10)} \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} - \sigma_1 W_{m,2}(k) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} = O_P(m^{\zeta-1/2}) = o_P(1).$$

similarly, by Lemma C.2

$$\begin{aligned}
(D.11) \quad & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right| + \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\
& = O_P(m^{-\zeta}) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{k^{1/2+\eta}}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\
& = O_P(m^{1/2-\zeta}) \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{k^{1/2+\eta-\psi}}{(m+k)^{1/2+\eta-\psi+1/2-\eta}} = O_P(m^{\eta-\zeta}) = o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

having chosen  $\eta < \zeta$ . Putting all together, (D.1) now follows for the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$ .

Let now

$$(D.12) \quad \Gamma(t) = \begin{cases} \delta^{1/2} |W_2(t) - tW_1(1)| & \text{if } E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0 \text{ holds} \\ \sigma_1 |W_2(t) - tW_1(1)| & \text{if } E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0 \text{ holds} \end{cases},$$

where  $\{W_1(k), 1 \leq k \leq m\}$  and  $\{W_2(k), 1 \leq k < \infty\}$  are two independent standard Wiener processes. Using the fact that the distribution of  $W_{m,1}(\cdot)$  and  $W_{m,2}(\cdot)$  does not depend on  $m$ , and exploiting the scale transformation and the continuity of the Wiener process

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\Gamma_m(k)}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\
& \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{k}{m}\right)}{\left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k/m}{1+k/m}\right)^\psi} \\
& \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sup_{0 < t < \infty} \frac{\Gamma(t)}{(1+t) \left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^\psi}.
\end{aligned}$$



Computing the covariance kernel, it can be easily verified that

$$(D.13) \quad \left\{ \frac{W_2(t) - tW_1(1)}{1+t}, t \geq 0 \right\} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \left\{ W\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right), t \geq 0 \right\},$$

where  $W(\cdot)$  denotes a standard Wiener. Hence

$$\max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\Gamma_m(k)}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sup_{0 < t < \infty} \frac{\delta \left| W\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right) \right|}{\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^\psi},$$

whence Theorem 3.1 follows. □

*Proof of Theorem 3.2.* Using exactly the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, it follows that

$$(D.14) \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{|Z_m(k) - \Gamma_m(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} = o_P(1).$$

Further, it is immediate to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{\Gamma_m(k)}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^\psi} \\ & \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{k}{m}\right)}{\left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k/m}{1+k/m}\right)^\psi} \\ & \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sup_{0 < t < m_0} \frac{\Gamma(t)}{(1+t) \left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^\psi}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (D.13), it finally follows

$$\sup_{0 < t < m_0} \frac{\Gamma(t)}{(1+t) \left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^\psi} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sup_{0 < t < m_0} \frac{\mathfrak{J} \left| W \left( \frac{t}{1+t} \right) \right|}{\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^\psi},$$

whence the desired result.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* We begin by noting that, repeating *verbatim* the proof of (D.1) with  $\psi = 1/2$ , it can be shown that

$$(D.15) \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{|Z_m(k) - \Gamma_m(k)|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} = O_P(1).$$

Recall also that the distribution of  $\Gamma_m(k)$  does not depend on  $m$ , so that

$$\{m^{-1/2}\Gamma_m(mt), t \geq 0\} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \{\Gamma(t), t \geq 0\},$$

where  $\Gamma(t)$  is defined in (D.12); further recall that, by (D.13)

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}} \frac{\Gamma(t)}{1+t}, t \geq 0 \right\} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \left\{ \left| W \left( \frac{t}{1+t} \right) \right|, t \geq 0 \right\}.$$

We now report some results concerning  $\Gamma_m(k)$ . We begin by studying

$$(D.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq \log m} \frac{\Gamma_m(k)}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \\ & \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}} \max_{1/m \leq t \leq (\log m)/m} \frac{\Gamma(t)}{(1+t) \left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^{1/2}} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1/m \leq t \leq (\log m)/m} \frac{\left| W \left( \frac{t}{1+t} \right) \right|}{\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^{1/2}} \\ & \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1/(m+1) \leq u \leq (\log m)/(m+\log m)} \frac{|W(u)|}{u^{1/2}} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1 \leq v \leq \log m} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$=O_P\left(\sqrt{\log \log \log m}\right),$$

where we have repeatedly used the scale transformation of the Wiener process, and the Law of the Iterated Logarithm in the last passage. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(D.17)} \quad & \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}} \max_{m/\log m \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{\Gamma_m(k)}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \\
& \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}} \max_{1/\log m \leq t \leq m^*/\log m} \frac{\Gamma(t)}{(1+t) \left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^{1/2}} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1/\log m \leq t \leq m^*/\log m} \frac{\left|W\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)\right|}{\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^{1/2}} \\
& \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1/(\log m+1) \leq u \leq m^*/(m+m^*)} \frac{|W(u)|}{u^{1/2}} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1 \leq v \leq m^*(\log m+1)/(m+m^*)} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}} \\
& =O_P\left(\sqrt{\log \log \frac{m^*(\log m+1)}{m+m^*}}\right) = O_P\left(\sqrt{\log \log \log m}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by the same token, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}} \max_{\log m \leq k \leq m/\log m} \frac{\Gamma_m(k)}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \\
& \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}} \max_{\log m \leq k \leq m/\log m} \frac{\Gamma_m\left(\frac{k}{m}\right)}{\left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \\
& \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \frac{1}{\mathfrak{J}} \max_{(\log m)/m \leq t \leq 1/\log m} \frac{\Gamma(t)}{(1+t) \left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^{1/2}} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{(\log m)/m \leq t \leq 1/\log m} \frac{\left|W\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)\right|}{\left(\frac{t}{1+t}\right)^{1/2}} \\
& \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{(\log m)/(m+\log m) \leq t \leq 1/(\log m+1)} \frac{|W(u)|}{u^{1/2}} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1 \leq v \leq (m+\log m)/((1+\log m)\log m)} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}},
\end{aligned}$$

and using the Law of the Iterated Logarithm it follows that

$$(D.18) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \log \log \frac{m + \log m}{(1 + \log m) \log m}}} \max_{1 \leq v \leq (m + \log m) / ((1 + \log m) \log m)} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}} = 1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Given that, as  $m \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{\log \log \frac{m + \log m}{(1 + \log m) \log m}}{\log \log m} = 1,$$

it follows that the term in (D.18) dominates, and therefore, putting all together

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{Z_m(k)}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} = \max_{1 \leq v \leq (m + \log m) / ((1 + \log m) \log m)} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}} \right\} = 1.$$

Using the Darling-Erdős theorem (Darling and Erdős, 1956), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \gamma \left( \log \frac{m + \log m}{(1 + \log m) \log m} \right) \max_{1 \leq v \leq (m + \log m) / ((1 + \log m) \log m)} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}} \right. \\ & \left. \leq x + \delta \left( \log \frac{m + \log m}{(1 + \log m) \log m} \right) \right\} = \exp(-\exp(-x)). \end{aligned}$$

The desired result follows upon noting that, by elementary arguments

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \gamma \left( \frac{m + \log m}{(1 + \log m) \log m} \right) - \gamma(m) \right| \rightarrow 0, \\ & \left| \delta \left( \frac{m + \log m}{(1 + \log m) \log m} \right) - \delta(m) \right| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 3.3.* We start with the proof of (3.4), considering the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ . As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, it suffices to show that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{Z_m^*(k)}{\bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{\bar{c}_{\alpha,\psi}} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \frac{|W(t)|}{t^\psi},$$

where

$$Z_m^*(k) = \left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \left( \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right|,$$

where recall that  $\bar{y}_i$  is the stationary solution of (2.1). Using the proofs of Lemmas C.1 and C.2, it follows by routine calculations that

$$\left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} - \frac{1}{ma_3} \right| = O_P(m),$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(m^{1/2}),$$

where  $a_3$  is defined in (C.2). The approximations in Aue et al. (2014) yield

$$(m^*)^{-1/2+\psi} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^\psi} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \left( \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - a_3 \right) \right| \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{\rightarrow} a_4 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \frac{|W(t)|}{t^\psi},$$

where

$$a_4 = \sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} E \left[ \left( \frac{\bar{y}_0^2}{1 + \bar{y}_0^2} - a_3 \right) \left( \frac{\bar{y}_h^2}{1 + \bar{y}_h^2} - a_3 \right) \right].$$

Thus we conclude

$$(m^*)^{-1/2+\psi} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left| \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^\psi} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \\ = O_P(m^{-1/2}) (m^*)^{-1/2+\psi} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^\psi} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \\ = O_P(m^{-1/2}) (m^*)^{-1/2+\psi} k^{1-\psi} \\ + O_P(m^{-1/2}) (m^*)^{-1/2+\psi} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^\psi} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \left( \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - a_3 \right)$$

$$=O_P \left( \left( \frac{m^*}{m} \right)^{1/2} + m^{-1/2} \right) = o_P(1).$$

Using Aue et al. (2014), we can define two independent Wiener processes  $\{W_{m,1}(x), x \geq 0\}$  and  $\{W_{m,2}(x), x \geq 0\}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{(m^*)^{1/2-\psi} k^\psi} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} - \left( a_1^{1/2} \sigma_1 W_{m,1}(k) + a_2^{1/2} \sigma_2 W_{m,2}(k) \right) \right| \\ & = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

By the scale transformation and the continuity of the Wiener process, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{(m^*)^{1/2-\psi} k^\psi} \left| a_1^{1/2} \sigma_1 W_{m,1}(k) + a_2^{1/2} \sigma_2 W_{m,2}(k) \right| \\ & \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1/m^* \leq k/m^* \leq 1} \left( \frac{k}{m^*} \right)^{-\psi} \left| a_1^{1/2} \sigma_1 W_{m,1} \left( \frac{k}{m^*} \right) + a_2^{1/2} \sigma_2 W_{m,2} \left( \frac{k}{m^*} \right) \right| \\ & \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{\rightarrow} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} \frac{1}{t^\psi} \left| a_1^{1/2} \sigma_1 W_1(t) + a_2^{1/2} \sigma_2 W_2(t) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  are independent Wiener processes. Since

$$\left\{ a_1^{1/2} \sigma_1 W_1(t) + a_2^{1/2} \sigma_2 W_2(t), t \geq 0 \right\} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \{ \delta W(t), t \geq 0 \},$$

where  $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$  is a Wiener process, the result follows.

Next we consider the case  $\psi = 1/2$ , and we establish a Darling-Erdős limiting law for  $Z_m^*(k)$ . Firstly note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^{1/2}} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \\ & = O_P \left( \left( \frac{m^*}{m} \right)^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{1}{(\log \log m^*)^{1/2}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^{1/2}} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P(1),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{(\log \log m^*)^{1/2}} \max_{\log m^* \leq k \leq m^*/\log m^*} \frac{1}{k^{1/2}} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} c > 0.$$

The above entails that we need to consider the maximum of  $Z_m^*(k)$  over  $\log m^* \leq k \leq m^*/\log m^*$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\log m^* \leq k \leq m^*/\log m^*} \frac{1}{k^{1/2}} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \\ &= O_P \left( \left( \frac{m^*}{m} \right)^{1/2} (\log m^*)^{-1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the Law of the Iterated Logarithm, it follows that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq \log m^*} \frac{1}{k^{1/2}} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| = O_P \left( (\log \log \log m^*)^{1/2} \right).$$

Hence we need to show that, for all  $-\infty < x < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \gamma (\log m^*) \frac{1}{\delta} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^{1/2}} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| \leq x + \delta (\log m^*) \right\} \\ &= \exp(-\exp(-x)), \end{aligned}$$

which follows from the same logic as the proof of Theorem 3.4.

We now turn to the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| \geq 0$ . Following the proof of Lemma C.1, it can be shown that

$$(D.19) \quad \left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} - \frac{1}{m} \right| = O_P(m^{-3/2}),$$

$$(D.20) \quad \left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) - \sum_{i=2}^m \epsilon_{i,1} \right| = O_P(1),$$

$$(D.21) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - k \right| = O_P(c^m),$$

and

$$(D.22) \quad \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \left| \left( \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} \right| = O_P(c^m),$$

with some  $0 < c < 1$ . Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left| \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right| (m^*)^{-1/2+\psi} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^\psi} \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \\ &= O_P(m^{-1/2}) (m^*)^{-1/2+\psi} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^\psi} (k + c^m) \\ &= O_P\left( \left( \frac{m^*}{m} \right)^{1/2} \right) = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Our assumptions entail that

$$(m^*)^{-1/2+\psi} \max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{k^\psi} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} \right| \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sigma_1 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \frac{|W(t)|}{t^\psi},$$

where  $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$  is a Wiener process; this completes the proof of (3.4). Considering the case  $\psi = 1/2$ , we can follow the same arguments as above, using (D.19)-(D.22). We obtain

$$\left| \max_{1 \leq k < m^*} \frac{|Z_m^*(k)|}{k^{1/2}} - \max_{\log m^* \leq k < m^*/\log m^*} \frac{1}{k^{1/2}} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} \right| \right| = o_P\left( (\log \log m^*)^{-1/2} \right).$$

Hence we need to prove only that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \gamma (\log m^*) \frac{1}{\sigma_1} \max_{\log m^* \leq k < m^*/\log m^*} \frac{1}{k^{1/2}} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} \right| \leq x + \delta (\log m^*) \right\} = \exp(-\exp(-x)),$$



which is shown in Csörgő and Horváth (1997).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.5.* Since the distributions of  $W_{m,1}(\cdot)$  and  $W_{m,2}(\cdot)$  do not depend on  $m$ , Corollary C.5 entails that, for all  $-\infty < x < \infty$

$$P \left\{ \max_{h_{m^*} \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{Z_m(k)}{g_{m,0.5}(k)} \geq x \right\} = P \left\{ \max_{h_{m^*} \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{\left| W_1(k) - \frac{k}{m} W_2(m) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \geq x \right\} + o(1),$$

as  $m^* \rightarrow \infty$ . In turn, this entails that we can construct critical values  $\hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}$  based on

$$P \left\{ \max_{h_{m^*} \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{\left| W_1(k) - \frac{k}{m} W_2(m) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \geq \hat{c}_{\alpha,0.5} \right\} = \alpha.$$

Using the scale transformation for Wiener processes

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{h_{m^*} \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{\left| W_1(k) - \frac{k}{m} W_2(m) \right|}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{m+k}\right)^{1/2}} \\ \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} & \max_{h_{m^*}/m^* \leq k/m^* \leq 1} \frac{\left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left| W\left(\frac{k/m}{1+k/m}\right) \right|}{\left(1 + \frac{k}{m}\right) \left(\frac{k/m}{1+k/m}\right)^{1/2}} \\ \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} & \max_{h_{m^*}/m^* \leq \tau \leq 1} \frac{\left| W\left(\frac{\tau}{1+\tau}\right) \right|}{\left(\frac{\tau}{1+\tau}\right)^{1/2}} \\ \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} & \max_{h_{m^*}/(m^*+h_{m^*}) \leq u \leq 1/2} \frac{|W(u)|}{u^{1/2}} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \max_{1 \leq v \leq \phi_m} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}} \\ \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} & \max_{1 \leq v \leq \exp(\log \phi_m)} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $W(\cdot)$  is a standard Wiener process and  $\phi_m = (m^* + h_{m^*}) / (2h_{m^*})$ . Using equation (18) in Vostrikova (1981), we have

$$P \left\{ \max_{1 \leq v \leq \exp(\log \phi_m)} \frac{|W(v)|}{v^{1/2}} \geq \widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5} \right\} \simeq \frac{\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}^2\right)}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} \left( \log \phi_m + \frac{4 - \log \phi_m}{\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}^2} + O(\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5}^{-4}) \right),$$

as  $\widehat{c}_{\alpha,0.5} \rightarrow \infty$ . This proves the claim.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.6.* The proof follows, with minor modifications, the proofs of the results above, so we only outline its main passages. We begin with part (i), and consider the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ . Lemma C.1 entails that we need to prove only that

$$(D.23) \quad \begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{1}{g_{m,\psi}(k)} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \left| \sum_{i=m+\ell}^{m+k} \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{k - \ell}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \right| \\ & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 < x < \infty} \frac{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t)) - (x - t)W_1(1)|}{(1+x)(x/(1+x))^\psi}, \end{aligned}$$

where recall that  $\bar{y}_i$  is the stationary solution of (2.1). The approximations in Lemma C.3 imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{1}{g_{m,\psi}(k)} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \left| \sum_{i=m+\ell}^{m+k} \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) - \frac{k - \ell}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \left( \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} \bar{y}_{i-1}^2}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} \bar{y}_{i-1}}{1 + \bar{y}_{i-1}^2} \right) \right| \\ & \rightarrow \left( W_{m,2}(k) - W_{m,2}(\ell) - \frac{k - \ell}{m} W_{m,1}(m) \right) \Big| \\ & = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

By the scale transformation and the continuity of the Wiener process we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \left( \frac{k+m}{k} \right)^\psi \frac{m}{m+k} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \left| \left( W_{m,2}(k) - W_{m,2}(\ell) - \frac{k - \ell}{m} W_{m,1}(m) \right) \right| \\ & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 < x < \infty} \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t)) - (x - t)W_1(1)|, \end{aligned}$$

whence the desired result.

Next we consider the nonstationary case. Applying Lemma C.2(ii), we can replace (D.23) with the proof of

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{1}{g_{m,\psi}(k)} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \left| \sum_{i=m+\ell}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - \frac{k-\ell}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right| \\ & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 < x < \infty} \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t)) - (x-t)W_1(1)|, \end{aligned}$$

which follows from the approximations in Lemma C.3(ii).

We conclude our proof by showing that

$$(D.24) \quad P \left\{ \sup_{0 < x < \infty} \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t)) - (x-t)W_1(1)| < \infty \right\} = 1.$$

When  $0 < x \leq 1$ , using Theorem 2.1 in Garsia et al. (1970),<sup>9</sup> it follows that there exists a random variable  $\zeta$  such that  $E|\zeta|^p < \infty$  for all  $p \geq 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t))| \\ & \leq |\zeta| \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} \left| \left( (x-t) \log \left( \frac{1}{x-t} \right) \right)^{1/2} \right| \end{aligned}$$

a.s., whence

$$\begin{aligned} (D.25) \quad & \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t)) - (x-t)W_1(1)| \\ & \leq |\zeta| \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} \left| \left( (x-t) \log \left( \frac{1}{x-t} \right) \right)^{1/2} \right| + W_1(1) \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |x-t|. \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>9</sup>See also Lemma 4.1 in Csörgő and Horváth, 1993.

It is now easy to see that

$$|\zeta| \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} \left| \left( (x-t) \log \left( \frac{1}{x-t} \right) \right)^{1/2} \right| = O_P(1).$$

As far as the second term in (D.25) is concerned, it immediately follows that

$$|W_1(1)| \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |x-t| = O_P(1) \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^{\psi-1} = O_P(1).$$

Also, by the Law of the Iterated Logarithm, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{1 \leq x < \infty} \left( \frac{1+x}{x} \right)^\psi \frac{1}{1+x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |(W_2(x) - W_2(t)) - (x-t)W_1(1)| \\ & \leq \sup_{1 \leq x < \infty} \frac{1}{x} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq x} |W_2(x)| + |W_1(1)| < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

a.s., whence (D.24) follows.

Finally, as far as parts (ii) and (iii) of the theorem are concerned, the proofs are based on the observation that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq m^*} \frac{1}{g_{m,\psi}^*(k)} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq k} \frac{k-\ell}{m} \left| \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} + \frac{\epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right| = o_P(1),$$

and the same using  $\bar{g}_{m,\psi}(k)$ ; hence, the arguments above can be repeated with minor modifications.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 3.1.* The result is shown e.g. in the proof of Theorem 3.4 in Horváth and Trapani (2016), or Corollary 3.1 in Horváth and Trapani (2023).  $\square$

In order to prove the next set of results, we will make use of the following decomposition, valid under (3.10)

$$(D.26) \quad Z_m(k) = \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k^*} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2 + \epsilon_{i,2} y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - \left( \hat{\beta}_m - \beta_0 \right) \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k^*} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\beta_A - \beta_0) \sum_{i=m+k^*+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+k^*+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1}y_{i-1}^2 + \epsilon_{i,2}y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \\
& - \left( \widehat{\beta}_m - \beta_0 \right) \sum_{i=m+k^*+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \Big|,
\end{aligned}$$

with the convention that  $\sum_a^b = 0$  whenever  $b < a$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.7.* Based on the results above, the theorem follows from standard arguments - see e.g. Theorem 4.1 in Horváth and Trapani (2023).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* We begin by decomposing the detector  $Z_m^X(k)$  as

$$(D.27) \quad Z_m^X(k) = \left| \left( \mathbf{b}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m \right)^\top \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} (y_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i^\top) \frac{y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{(\epsilon_{i,1}y_{i-1} + \epsilon_{i,2})y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right|.$$

Henceforth, the proof is very similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1, and we only report the main passages where the two proofs differ.

Consider first the case  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ ; using Lemmas C.6-C.8 instead of Lemmas C.1-C.3, it can be shown along the same lines as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 that

$$\max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{Z_m^X(k)}{m^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{k}{\delta_x^2 m}\right) \left(\frac{k}{k + \delta_x^2 m}\right)^\psi} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{0 < t < \infty} \frac{|-\delta_{x,1}tW_1(1) + \delta_{x,2}W_2(t)|}{\left(1 + \frac{t}{\delta_x^2}\right) \left(\frac{t}{t + \delta_x^2}\right)^\psi},$$

where  $\{W_1(t), t \geq 0\}$  and  $\{W_2(t), t \geq 0\}$  are two independent standard Wiener processes.

It is not hard to see that

$$\sup_{0 < t < \infty} \frac{|-\delta_{x,1}tW_1(1) + \delta_{x,2}W_2(t)|}{\left(1 + \frac{t}{\delta_x^2}\right) \left(\frac{t}{t + \delta_x^2}\right)^\psi} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sup_{0 < u < \infty} \frac{|-\delta_{x,1}\delta_x^2 uW_1(1) + \delta_{x,2}W_2(\delta_x^2 u)|}{(1 + u) \left(\frac{u}{1 + u}\right)^\psi},$$

and that, for  $u \leq v$

$$E \left( (-\delta_{x,1}\delta_x^2 uW_1(1) + \delta_{x,2}W_2(\delta_x^2 u)) (-\delta_{x,1}\delta_x^2 vW_1(1) + \delta_{x,2}W_2(\delta_x^2 v)) \right)$$

$$= \mathfrak{J}_{x,1}^2 (\mathfrak{J}_x^2)^2 uv + \mathfrak{J}_{x,2}^2 \mathfrak{J}_x^2 u = \frac{\mathfrak{J}_{x,2}^4}{\mathfrak{J}_{x,1}^2} (uv + u).$$

Hence it follows that

$$\left\{ \frac{-\mathfrak{J}_{x,1} \mathfrak{J}_x^2 u W_1(1) + \mathfrak{J}_{x,2} W_2(\mathfrak{J}_x^2 u)}{1+u}, u \geq 0 \right\} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \left\{ \frac{\mathfrak{J}_{x,2}^2 W(u)}{\mathfrak{J}_{x,1}}, u \geq 0 \right\},$$

where  $\{W(u), u \geq 0\}$  is an independent standard Wiener process. This completes the proof when  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| < 0$ .

When  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$ , consider (D.27) again. Seeing as

$$(D.28) \quad \left\| \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{x}_i y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right\| = O_P(1),$$

it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left( \mathbf{b}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m \right)^\top \left( \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} (y_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i^\top) \frac{y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} (y_{i-1}, \mathbf{0}_p^\top) \frac{y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \left\| \mathbf{b}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m \right\| \left\| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} (y_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i^\top) \frac{y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} (y_{i-1}, \mathbf{0}_p^\top) \frac{y_{i-1}}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right\| \\ & = O_P(m^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{0}_p$  is a  $p$ -dimensional vector of zeros. Similarly, using (D.28) and standard algebra, it follows that

$$\left\| \left( \mathbf{b}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m \right)^\top - \left( \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right), \mathbf{0}_p^\top \right) \right\| = O_P(m^{-1/2}),$$

and by (C.13)

$$\max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{1}{k} \left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} \right) \left( \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1+y_{i-1}^2} - k \right) \right| = O_P(m^{-1/2-\zeta}),$$

for some  $\zeta > 0$ , and similarly to (C.5)-(C.6)

$$\left| \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} \right) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \epsilon_{i,1} \right| = O_P(m^{1/2-\zeta}).$$

Thus, putting all together

$$\max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{1}{k} \left| \left( \mathbf{b}_0 - \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_m \right)^\top \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} (y_{i-1}, \mathbf{x}_i^\top) \frac{y_{i-1}}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - \frac{k}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \epsilon_{i,1} \right| = O_P(m^{-1/2-\zeta}).$$

Finally, similarly to (C.14) it can be shown

$$\max_{1 \leq k < \infty} k^{-1/2-\eta} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \frac{\epsilon_{i,1} y_{i-1}^2}{1 + y_{i-1}^2} - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} \right| = O_P(m^{-\zeta}),$$

for some  $\zeta > 0$  and for all  $\eta > 0$ . Putting all together and recalling that, when  $E \log |\beta_0 + \epsilon_{0,1}| > 0$ ,  $\mathfrak{d}_x^2 = 1$ , it follows that

$$\max_{1 \leq k < \infty} \frac{\left| Z_m^X(k) - \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \epsilon_{i,1} - \frac{k}{m} \sum_{i=2}^m \epsilon_{i,1} \right| \right|}{m^{1/2} \left( 1 + \frac{k}{m} \right) \left( \frac{k}{k+m} \right)^\psi} = o_P(1).$$

Hereafter, the final result follows by making appeal to the proof of Theorem 3.1.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* The proof follows immediately from the approximations derived above, and from the proof of Theorem 3.4.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.10.* The proof follows by the same arguments as the proof of Theorem 3.6, and we therefore omit it to save space.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* The proof follows from the same arguments as in the case with no covariates.  $\square$