Inference in semiparametric formation models for directed networks

Lianqiang Qu[†], Lu Chen[†], Ting Yan[†] and Yuguo Chen[‡] School of Mathematics and Statistics[†], Central China Normal University, Wuhan, Hubei, 430079, P.R.China Department of Statistics[‡], University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL 61820

Abstract

We propose a semiparametric model for dyadic link formations in directed networks. The model contains a set of degree parameters that measure different effects of popularity or outgoingness across nodes, a regression parameter vector that reflects the homophily effect resulting from the nodal attributes or pairwise covariates associated with edges, and a set of latent random noises with unknown distributions. Our interest lies in inferring the unknown degree parameters and homophily parameters. The dimension of the degree parameters increases with the number of nodes. Under the high-dimensional regime, we develop a kernel-based least squares approach to estimate the unknown parameters. The major advantage of our estimator is that it does not encounter the incidental parameter problem for the homophily parameters. We prove consistency of all the resulting estimators of the degree parameters and homophily parameters. We establish high-dimensional central limit theorems for the proposed estimators and provide several applications of our general theory, including testing the existence of degree heterogeneity, testing sparse signals and recovering the support. Simulation studies and a real data application are conducted to illustrate the finite sample performance of the proposed methods.

Keywords: Degree heterogeneity, Directed network formation, Gaussian approximation, High dimension, Homophily.

1 Introduction

Network data arise frequently in many fields like genetics, sociology, finance and econometrics. Networks consist of nodes and edges linking one node to another. The node may represent a person in social networks, a user in email networks, or a country in international trade networks. Homophily and degree heterogeneity are two commonly observed features of real-world social and economic networks. Homophily implies that nodes in a network tend to have more links to those with similar attributes than to nodes with dissimilar attributes. The degree heterogeneity describes variations in the number of edges among nodes, where a small number of nodes have many edges, whereas a large number of nodes have relatively fewer edges. Quantifying the influence of these network features on edge formation is a key issue in network analysis. See Kolaczyk & Csárdi (2014) for a comprehensive review on network analysis.

The presence and extent of homophily and degree heterogeneity have implications for network formation (Graham, 2017; Yan et al., 2019). Several parametric models have been proposed to characterize these two important network features (e.g., Graham, 2017; Dzemski, 2019; Yan et al., 2019; De Paula, 2020; Graham, 2020), where the estimation and inference methods depend on a specified distribution for latent random noises. For instance, Graham (2017) and Yan et al. (2019) assume a logistic distribution, whereas Dzemski (2019) assumes a normal distribution. However, network modeling based on a specific parametric distribution can be susceptible to model misspecification and the potential instabilities. When the assumed parametric distribution is not suitable, inference may have non-negligible biases as demonstrated by the simulation results in Table 3 of Section 7.

In this study, we propose a semiparametric framework to model homophily and degree heterogeneity in directed networks. We note that semiparametric inferences on the homophily parameter have been studied in undirected networks (Toth, 2017; Zeleneev, 2020; Candelaria, 2020). We will elaborate on them after we state our main results. Our model assigns two node-specific parameters α_i and β_i to each node: α_i for out-degree and β_i for in-degree. We collect these as the set of out-degree parameters $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and the set of in-degree parameters $\{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^n$, with n denoting the number of nodes in the directed graph. Moreover, the model has one common homophily parameter γ for pairwise covariates $\{X_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n$ amongst nodes. In the model, an edge from node i to j is presented if the sum of the degree effects $\alpha_i + \beta_j$ and the covariates effect $X_{ij}^{\top}\gamma$ exceeds a latent random noise with an unknown distribution. This modelling strategy inherits an additive structure from existing literature (e.g. Graham, 2017; Dzemski, 2019; Yan et al., 2019).

Estimating degree parameters and homophily parameters are equally important since the edge formation is decided by not only homophily but also degree heterogeneity as mentioned before. If we want to infer the connection probabilities between nodes, both parameters need to be estimated. Therefore, our objective is to estimate the homophily parameter γ and the degree parameters $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^n$ simultanously. It is well-known that the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of γ has a non-negligible bias (Neyman & Scott, 1948; Graham, 2017; Fernández-Val & Weidner, 2016) and bias-correction procedures are needed to validate inference (Yan et al., 2019; Hughes, 2022). A natural question is: Is it possible to not only find an unbiased estimator for the homophily but also obtain the estimators for the degree parameters simultaneously? To the best of our knowledge, this problem has not yet been addressed in the existing literature. Estimating degree parameters enables us to test for the presence of degree heterogeneity in a sub-network with a fixed or increasing number of nodes. This can help us gain insights into the extent of variation in degrees within the sub-network and understand whether certain nodes have significantly different levels of attractiveness or popularity compared to others.

To address the problem, we adopt a projection approach to estimate the unknown parameters. Specifically, this approach includes three steps. First, we obtain a kernel smoothing estimator for the conditional density of a special regressor given other covariates. A covariate is called a special regressor if it is continuous and has a positive coefficient (Lewbel, 1998, 2000). Second, we obtain an unbiased estimator of γ by projecting the covariates onto the subspace spanned by the column vectors of the design matrix of degree parameters. The projection helps eliminate the potential bias caused by the degree parameters. Finally, we estimate the degree parameters using a constrained least squares method. We establish consistency and asymptotic normality of the resulting estimators when the number of nodes goes to infinity. It is remarkable that the estimator of the homophily parameter does not have a bias problem, unlike the MLE (Graham, 2017; Yan et al., 2019). Furthermore, our asymptotic distributions for the degree parameters are high-dimensional, improving upon the fixed dimensional results of Yan et al. (2019). Based on the asymptotic results, we develop hypothesis testing methods to study three related problems: (1) testing whether α_i and β_i are zero, that is, testing for sparse signals; (2) determining which of α_i and β_i are not zero, that is, support recovery and (3) testing whether $\alpha_i = \alpha_j$ and $\beta_i = \beta_j$ in a sub-network, that is, testing the existence of the degree heterogeneity. We further extend our results to weighted networks and also a scenario where the latent random noise is conditionally independent.

As mentioned before, inferences have been made in semiparamtric models for undirected networks (Toth, 2017; Candelaria, 2020; Zeleneev, 2020). All these studies treated degree parameters as random variables while we treat them as fixed parameters. Toth (2017) used conditional methods to remove the degree parameters and proposed a tetrad inequality estimator for the homophily parameter. Zeleneev (2020) constructed estimators for homophily parameters based on a conditional pseudo-distance between two nodes for measuring the similarity of degree heterogeneity. The work closely related to our paper is Candelaria (2020), which also introduced the special regressor method for analyzing the problem of model identification. However, his estimation strategies are built on the information contained in all sub-networks formed by groups of four distinct nodes, generalizing Graham's (2017) tetrad estimator to the semiparametric framework. Here, our estimator for the homophily parameter is based on a projection method, which is different from Candelaria (2020). Furthermore, the estimation for degree parameters is not investigated in Toth (2017), Candelaria (2020) and Zeleneev (2020). Additionally, while Gao (2020) derived identification results for nonparametric models of undirected networks, the estimation aspect remains unexplored.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the semiparametric network formation models. Section 3 provides the conditions for model identification and presents the estimation method. Section 4 provides consistency and Gaussian approximations of the proposed estimators. Section 5 presents some applications of the general theory. Section 6 provides extensions to the proposed method. Section 7 reports on the simulation studies and a real data analysis. Section 8 presents concluding remarks. The technical details and additional numerical results are in the Online Supplementary Material.

We conclude this section by introducing some notation. Denote N = n(n-1). Let e_i be a (2n-1)-dimensional row vector with the *i*th element being 1 and 0 otherwise $(i = 1, \ldots, 2n-1)$, and e_{2n} be the (2n-1)-dimensional zero vector. For vector $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the ℓ_p -norm $||x||_p = (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^p)^{1/p}$ and the ℓ_∞ -norm $||x||_\infty = \max_{1 \le i \le n} |x_i|$. We define $D = \text{diag}\{d_1, \ldots, d_n\}$ as a diagonal matrix, where d_i is the *i*th element on the diagonal. Let I_n denote the $n \times n$ identity matrix, and $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ denote the indicator function. For a matrix $D = (d_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, define $||D||_{\max} = \max_{1 \le l \le p, \ 1 \le k \le q} |d_{ij}|$. For the positive sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we write $a_n = o(b_n)$ if $a_n/b_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, and write $a_n = O(b_n)$ if there exists a constant C such that $a_n \le Cb_n$ for all n. For vectors $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^\top$ and $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\top$, we write $x \le y$ if $x_i \le y_i$ for all $1 \le i \le n$. For any positive integer n, we denote the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ as [n]. For any set B, denote its cardinality as |B|. Denote by $\lfloor x \rfloor$ the integer part of a positive real number x. The symbol $\mathcal{N}_n(\mu, \Sigma)$ is reserved for an n-dimensional multivariate normal distribution with mean μ and covariance matrix Σ . We use the subscript "0" to denote the true parameter, under which the data are generated. For example, α_{0i} is the true value of α_i .

2 Semiparametric network formation models

Consider a directed network on n nodes labelled as "1, 2, ..., n", and let $A = (A_{ij})_{n \times n}$ denote the adjacency matrix. When there is a directed edge from node i pointing to j, we encode $A_{ij} = 1$; otherwise, we set $A_{ij} = 0$. In the present study, assume no self-loops (i.e., $A_{ii} = 0$ for $i \in [n]$) in the network. Let the random vector $X_{ij} = (X_{ij1}, \ldots, X_{ij,p+1})^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$ denote the covariate for the node pair (i, j), which can be either a link-dependent vector or a function of the node-specific covariates. For example, if node i has a d-dimensional characteristic W_i , the pairwise covariate

 X_{ij} can be constructed by setting $X_{ij} = ||W_i - W_j||_2$. Thus, under this specific choice of X_{ij} , the smaller the value of X_{ij} is, the more similar nodes *i* and *j* are. Here, we make the assumption that *p* is fixed and that A_{ij} are conditionally independent across $1 \le i \ne j \le n$, given the covariates X_{ij} .

To capture the aforementioned two network features: homophily effects and degree heterogeneity, we consider the following semiparametric link formation model for directed networks:

$$A_{ij} = \mathbb{I}(\alpha_i + \beta_j + X_{ij}^\top \gamma - \varepsilon_{ij} > 0), \qquad (2.1)$$

where α_i represents the outgoingness parameter of node i, β_j denotes the popularity parameter of node j, and γ is the regression coefficient of the covariate X_{ij} . In the model, ε_{ij} denotes the unobserved latent noise, where we assume $\mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_{ij}|X_{ij}) = 0$ almost surely. The model states that an edge from node i to j is formed if the total effect consisting of outgoingness of node i, popularity of node j and covariates effect $X_{ij}^{\top}\gamma$ exceeds the noise.

The sets of parameters $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ characterize the heterogeneity of nodes in participating in network connections. Larger values of α_i and β_i indicate a higher propensity for node i to form links to other nodes in the network. The term $X_{ij}^{\top}\gamma$ allows homophily. For example, if $X_{ij} = ||W_i - W_j||_2$ and $\gamma < 0$, then a larger $X_{ij}^{\top}\gamma$ makes homophilous nodes more likely to interact with each other. Therefore, γ can capture the homophily effect of covariates (e.g., Graham, 2017; Yan et al., 2019). The noise ε_{ij} accounts for the unobserved random factors that influence the decision to form a specific interaction from i to j.

We illustrate model (2.1) with two examples. When ε_{ij} is a random variable from a logistic distribution, model (2.1) becomes a generalized logistic regression model (Graham, 2017; Yan et al., 2019). In addition, model (2.1) reduces to a probit model, while ε_{ij} follows a normal distribution (Dzemski, 2019).

3 Identification and estimation

3.1 Identification of parameters

In this section, we discuss the conditions under which model (2.1) is identifiable. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)^{\top}$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n)^{\top}$. Obviously, model (2.1) remains unchanged if we transform the parameter vector (α, β, γ) to $(a\alpha + c, a\beta - c, a\gamma)$, where a > 0 and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. This is because

$$A_{ij} = \mathbb{I}(\alpha_i + \beta_j + X_{ij}^\top \gamma - \varepsilon_{ij} > 0) = \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{\alpha}_i + \widetilde{\beta}_j + X_{ij}^\top \widetilde{\gamma} - \widetilde{\varepsilon}_{ij} > 0),$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}_i = a\alpha_i + c$, $\tilde{\beta}_j = a\beta_j - c$, $\tilde{\gamma} = a\gamma$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{ij} = a\varepsilon_{ij}$. In other words, model (2.1) is scale-shift invariant and requires certain restrictions on the parameters α_i, β_i and γ for identification. One common way to avoid scale invariance is to set $\gamma_k = 1$, where γ_k is the *k*th component of γ , and *k* is chosen such that X_{ijk} is a continuous random variable. In addition, we can set $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i = 0$ or $\beta_n = 0$ to avoid shift invariance. However, the identification of the parameters in model (2.1) depends crucially on the support of the joint distribution of $(X_{ij}, \varepsilon_{ij})$. To illustrate this, we consider an example, where the identification fails even if we set $\gamma_k = 1$. Let $X_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ be a random variable with the support $(-4, -3) \cup (0, 1)$. We set $\gamma_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_1 = 1$, $\alpha_i + \beta_j = 1$ for $1 \le i \ne j \le n$, and $\tilde{\alpha}_i + \tilde{\beta}_j = a(\alpha_i + \beta_j)$, where $a \in [1, 2]$. In addition, let ε_{ij} and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{ij}$ be obtained from the uniform distribution on (-1, 1). In this scenario, we have

$$X_{ij} > \varepsilon_{ij} - 1$$
 if $X_{ij} \in (0, 1)$ and $X_{ij} < \varepsilon_{ij} - 1$ otherwise,
 $X_{ij} > \widetilde{\varepsilon}_{ij} - a$ if $X_{ij} \in (0, 1)$ and $X_{ij} < \widetilde{\varepsilon}_{ij} - a$ otherwise.

In other words, $A_{ij} = \widetilde{A}_{ij}$ almost surely if $a \in [1,2]$, where $\widetilde{A}_{ij} = \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{\alpha}_i + \widetilde{\beta}_j + X_{ij}^\top \widetilde{\gamma} - \widetilde{\varepsilon}_{ij} > 0)$. Therefore, model (2.1) cannot be identified in the parameter set $\{(\alpha, \beta) : 1 \leq \alpha_i + \beta_j \leq 2, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n\}$. However, if we change the support of X_{ij} to (-4, 4), then the support of $\alpha_i + \beta_j - \varepsilon_{ij}$ is a subset of (-4, 4). This leads to $\mathbb{P}(A_{ij} \neq \widetilde{A}_{ij}) > 0$ when $\widetilde{\alpha}_i + \widetilde{\beta}_j \neq \alpha_i + \beta_j$. In this case, the unidentifiable problem does not exist.

Motivated by the above example, we consider the following conditions to guarantee model identification.

Condition (C1). There exists at least one $k \in [p+1]$ such that $\gamma_{0k} > 0$ and the conditional distribution of X_{ijk} given $X_{ij(-k)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure with nondegenerate conditional density $f(x|X_{ij(-k)})$, where γ_{0k} is the kth element of γ_0 and $X_{ij(-k)} = (X_{ij1}, \ldots, X_{ij,k-1}, X_{ij,k+1}, \ldots, X_{ij,p+1})^{\top}$.

The covariate X_{ijk} satisfying Condition (C1) is called a special regressor (Lewbel, 1998; Candelaria, 2020). For simplicity, we assume that X_{ij1} satisfies Condition (C1), and write $Z_{ij} = X_{ij(-1)}$. Condition (C2). The conditional density $f(x|Z_{ij})$ of X_{ij1} given Z_{ij} has support (B_L, B_U) , where $-\infty \leq B_L < 0 < B_U \leq \infty$. Additionally, the support for $-(\alpha_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + Z_{ij}^{\top} \eta_0 - \varepsilon_{ij})/\gamma_{01}$ is a subset of (B_L, B_U) , where $\eta_0 = (\gamma_{02}, \ldots, \gamma_{0,p+1})^{\top}$.

Condition (C2) restricts the support of X_{ij1} , which is mild and has been widely adopted by Manski (1985), Lewbel (1998, 2000) and Candelaria (2020). Conditions (C1) and (C2) do not impose restrictions on the distribution of Z_{ij} . Thus, this identification strategy allows for discrete covariates in Z_{ij} . **Condition (C3).** ε_{ij} $(1 \le i \ne j \le n)$ are independent of X_{ij} and $\mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_{ij}) = 0$.

Let $Z = (Z_1^{\top}, \ldots, Z_n^{\top})^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$ with $Z_i = (Z_{i1}, \ldots, Z_{i,i-1}, Z_{i,i+1}, \ldots, Z_{in})^{\top}$ for $i \in [n]$. Recall that e_i denotes a standard basis vector of length (2n - 1) with the *i*th element 1 and others 0. Let $U = (u_1^{\top}, \ldots, u_N^{\top})^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times (2n-1)}$ be the design matrix for the parameter vector $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{(n-1)})$, where for each $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $1 \leq j \leq n-1$, $u_{k(n-1)+j} = e_{k+1} + e_{n+j+1}$ if $j \geq k+1$ and $u_{k(n-1)+j} = e_{k+1} + e_{n+j}$ otherwise. Let $V = U^{\top}U \in \mathbb{R}^{(2n-1) \times (2n-1)}$, whose explicit expression is given in (B.1) of the Supplementary Material. Define the projection matrix D:

$$D = I_N - UV^{-1}U^{\top} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}.$$
(3.1)

Condition (C4). There exists some positive constant ϕ such that $\phi_{\min}(Z^{\top}DZ/N) > \phi$ almost surely, where $\phi_{\min}(H)$ denotes the smallest eigenvalue of any matrix H.

Conditions (C3) and (C4) are mild. Condition (C3) assumes independence between ε_{ij} and X_{ij} . However, this assumption can be relaxed to the scenario where ε_{ij} is conditionally independent of X_{ij1} given Z_{ij} , as discussed in Section 6. Condition (C4) guarantees the existence and uniqueness of η_0 .

Following Lewbel (1998) and Candelaria (2020), we define

$$Y_{ij} = \frac{A_{ij} - \mathbb{I}(X_{ij1} > 0)}{f(X_{ij1} | Z_{ij})}$$

Let $Y_i = (Y_{i1}, \ldots, Y_{i,i-1}, Y_{i,i+1}, \ldots, Y_{in})^\top$, $i \in [n]$ and $Y = (Y_1^\top, \ldots, Y_n^\top)^\top$. The conditional expectation of Y_{ij} is stated below.

Theorem 1. If Conditions (C1)-(C3) hold, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{ij}|Z_{ij}) = (\alpha_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + Z_{ij}^{\top} \eta_0) / \gamma_{01}.$$

The proofs of Theorem 1 and all other theoretical results are provided in the Supplementary Material. Theorem 1 states that the parameters in model (2.1) are identified up to scale under Conditions (C1)-(C3). Theorem 1 also states that the expectation of Y_{ij} conditional on Z_{ij} has an additive structure on α_{0i} , β_{0j} and a homophily term $Z_{ij}^{\top}\eta_0$. This implies that the unknown parameters α_0 , β_0 and η_0 can be recovered using the random variables Y_{ij} . In the following, we further assume $\gamma_{01} = 1$ and $\beta_{0n} = 0$ for the identification of model (2.1).

3.2 Estimation methods

In this section, we develop a procedure to estimating all unknown parameters. Let $\widehat{f}(X_{ij1}|Z_{ij})$ be a nonparametric estimator of $f(X_{ij1}|Z_{ij})$, which is discussed later. Correspondingly, we define \widehat{Y}_{ij} as

$$\widehat{Y}_{ij} = \frac{A_{ij} - \mathbb{I}(X_{ij1} \ge 0)}{\widehat{f}(X_{ij1}|Z_{ij})},$$

and write $\widehat{Y} = (\widehat{Y}_1^\top, \dots, \widehat{Y}_n^\top)^\top$, where $\widehat{Y}_i = (\widehat{Y}_{i1}, \dots, \widehat{Y}_{i,i-1}, \widehat{Y}_{i,i+1}, \dots, \widehat{Y}_{in})^\top$ for $i \in [n]$.

We first consider the estimation of $\eta_0 = (\gamma_{02}, \ldots, \gamma_{0,p+1})^{\top}$. Define $\theta = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{n-1})^{\top}$. By Theorem 1 and the conditions $\beta_{0n} = 0$ and $\gamma_{01} = 1$, we have

$$Z^{\top}D\mathbb{E}(Y|Z) = Z^{\top}D(U\theta + Z\eta_0) = Z^{\top}DZ\eta_0,$$

where the second equality is due to DU = 0 according to the definition of the projection matrix D in (3.1). Thus, we estimate η_0 by

$$\widehat{\eta} = (Z^\top D Z)^{-1} Z^\top D \widehat{Y}.$$

For estimating α_0 and β_0 , we employ a constrained least squares method. Specifically, we estimate α_0 and β_0 by

$$(\widehat{\alpha}^{\top}, \widehat{\beta}^{\top})^{\top} = \arg\min_{\alpha, \beta} \mathcal{M}(\alpha, \beta, \widehat{\eta}) \text{ subject to } \beta_n = 0,$$

where $\mathcal{M}(\alpha, \beta, \eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} (\widehat{Y}_{ij} - \alpha_i - \beta_j - Z_{ij}^{\top} \eta)^2$. Define $\widehat{\theta} = (\widehat{\alpha}^{\top}, \widehat{\beta}^{\top})^{\top}$ as the estimator of θ . When the covariate matrix Z is projected onto the subspace spanned by the column vectors of U, we have $Z^{\top}DU = 0$. It further implies that $(Z^{\top}DZ)^{-1}Z^{\top}DU\widehat{\theta} = 0$. Therefore, the projection procedure helps eliminate the potential bias of $\widehat{\eta}$ caused by the degree parameters.

We now discuss the nonparametric estimator $\widehat{f}(x|Z_{ij})$ of $f(x|Z_{ij})$. We divide Z_{ij} into two subvectors \widetilde{Z}_{ij1} and \widetilde{Z}_{ij2} , where \widetilde{Z}_{ij1} comprises all continuous elements of Z_{ij} , and \widetilde{Z}_{ij2} contains the remaining discrete elements of Z_{ij} . We use the Nadaraya-Watson type estimator (Watson, 1964; Nadaraya, 1964) for $f(x|Z_{ij})$:

$$\widehat{f}(x|\widetilde{Z}_{ij1} = z_1, \widetilde{Z}_{ij2} = z_2) = \frac{\sum_{1 \le i \ne j \le n} \mathcal{K}_{xz,h}(X_{ij1} - x, \widetilde{Z}_{ij1} - z_1) \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{Z}_{ij2} = z_2)}{\sum_{1 \le i \ne j \le n} \mathcal{K}_{z,h}(\widetilde{Z}_{ij1} - z_1) \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{Z}_{ij2} = z_2)}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{xz,h}(x,z) = h^{-(p_1+1)}\mathcal{K}_{xz}(x/h,z/h)$ and $\mathcal{K}_{z,h}(x) = h^{-p_1}\mathcal{K}_z(z/h)$. Here, $\mathcal{K}_{xz}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{K}_z(\cdot)$ are

two kernel functions, h denotes a bandwidth parameter, and p_1 denotes the number of continuous covariates in Z_{ij} .

4 Theoretical Results

In this section, we present consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimators. To achieve this, additional conditions are required.

Condition (C5). $\max_{i,j} ||Z_{ij}||_{\infty} \leq \kappa$ almost surely, where κ is allowed to diverge with n. Here, we suppress the subscript n in κ .

Condition (C6). There exists some constant m such that $f(x|Z_{ij}) > m > 0$ on the support of X_{ij1} . In addition, the rth order partial derivative of the probability density function $f_Z(z)$ of Z_{ij} with respect to continuous components of Z_{ij} exists and is continuous and bounded. The rth order partial derivative of the joint density function $f_{XZ}(x, z)$ of (X_{ij1}, Z_{ij}) with respect to continuous entries of the vector (X_{ij1}, Z_{ij}) is also continuous and bounded. Here, m is allowed to decrease towards zero as $n \to \infty$, and we suppress the subscript n in m.

Condition (C7). The kernel function $\mathcal{K}_z(z)$ is a symmetric and piecewise Lipschitz continuous kernel of order r. That is, $\int \cdots \int \mathcal{K}_z(z_1, \ldots, z_{p_1}) dz_1 \cdots dz_{p_1} = 1$,

$$\int \cdots \int z_1^{j_1} \dots z_{p_1}^{j_{p_1}} \mathcal{K}_z(z_1, \dots, z_{p_1}) dz_1 \cdots dz_{p_1} = 0 \quad (0 < j_1 + \dots + j_{p_1} < r),$$

$$\int \cdots \int z_1^{j_1} \dots z_{p_1}^{j_{p_1}} \mathcal{K}_z(z_1, \dots, z_{p_1}) dz_1 \cdots dz_{p_1} \neq 0 \quad (0 < j_1 + \dots + j_{p_1} = r).$$

In addition, it is a bounded differentiable function with absolutely integrable Fourier transforms. All of the conditions also hold for $\mathcal{K}_{xz}(x, z)$ by replacing z with (x, z).

Condition (C5) assumes the boundedness of Z_{ij} , which is required to simplify the proof of the following theorems. However, it can be relaxed to sub-Gaussian variables. The first part of Condition (C6), together with Theorem 1, implies that $\max_{1 \le i \ne j \le n} |\alpha_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + Z_{ij}^{\top} \eta_0| < 2/m$ almost surely. Individual-specific parameters α_i and β_i can be utilized to determine the level of sparsity in a network (e.g., Chen et al., 2021; Stein & Leng, 2023). If $q_n = \max_{1 \le i \ne j \le n} |\alpha_{0i} + \beta_{0j}|$ is of order $\log(n)$, then m is of order at least $1/(\log(n) + \kappa)$. In addition, this requires that the support $[B_L, B_U]$ of the special regressor X_{ij1} must satisfy $B_L = O(\log n + \kappa)$ and $B_U = O(\log n + \kappa)$. The second part of Condition (C6) is mild and similar conditions have been used in different contexts (e.g., Andrews, 1995; Honoré & Lewbel, 2002; Aradillas-Lopez, 2012; Candelaria, 2020). Condition (C7) requires the use of a higher-order kernel. This condition is widely adopted in different contexts; see Andrews (1995), Lewbel (1998), Honoré & Lewbel (2002), Qi et al. (2005) and Candelaria (2020). In the following, we redefine $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$, excluding element β_n . Define θ_0 as the true value of θ . Recall $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\alpha}^\top, \hat{\beta}^\top)^\top$. Consistency of $\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{\eta}$ is stated below.

Theorem 2. Suppose that Conditions (C1)-(C7) hold. If

$$\frac{(\kappa + q_n)^2}{\phi m^2} \left[\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n^2 h^{2p_1 + 2}}} + h^r \right] = o(1), \tag{4.1}$$

then we have

$$\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\|_{\infty} = o_p(1).$$
$$\|\widehat{\eta} - \eta_0\|_{\infty} = o_p(1).$$

Condition (4.1) in the above theorem restricts the increasing rate of κ and the decreasing rates of m and ϕ , where ϕ , κ and m are specified in Conditions (C4)-(C6), respectively. Moreover, the presence of the terms involving h in (4.1) is due to controlling the bias and variance of \hat{Y}_{ij} by using the kernel smoothing method. It implies that the bandwidth h has impacts on the behavior of the estimator, both theoretically and practically. When κ , ϕ and m are constants, it requires $h \to 0$ and $n^2 h^{2p_1+2}/\log(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ to guarantee consistency of the estimators.

Next, we present a high-dimensional central limit theorem for the estimators $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$. Specifically, we consider the inferences on $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}\alpha_0$, $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}\beta_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_2\eta_0$, where $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}$, $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}$ and \mathcal{L}_2 denote $M_{1\alpha} \times n$, $M_{1\beta} \times (n-1)$ and $M_2 \times p$ matrices, respectively. This can be used to construct confidence intervals for the linear combinations of parameters α_0 , β_0 and η_0 .

To obtain asymptotic distributions of the estimators, we need an additional condition.

Condition (C8). (i) $0 < M_{1\alpha} \le n$ and $0 < M_{1\beta} \le n$. (ii) There exist some constants $s_{U\alpha}$, $s_{U\beta}$, $L_{U\alpha}$ and $L_{U\beta}$ (independent of n) such that $1 \le \max_{k \in [M_{1\alpha}]} |S_{k\alpha}| \le s_{U\alpha}$, $1 \le \max_{k \in [M_{1\beta}]} |S_{k\beta}| \le s_{U\beta}$, $\|\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}\|_{\max} \le L_{U\alpha}$ and $\|\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}\|_{\max} \le L_{U\beta}$, where $S_{k\alpha} = \{j : L_{1,kj}^{\alpha} \ne 0\}$, $S_{k\beta} = \{j : L_{1,kj}^{\beta} \ne 0\}$. Here, $L_{1,kj}^{\alpha}$ and $L_{1,kj}^{\beta}$ denote the (k, j)th elements of $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}$, respectively.

The first part of Condition (C8) implies that the row dimensions $M_{1\alpha} \leq n$ and $M_{1\beta} \leq n-1$ of the matrices $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}$ can increase as n increases. This means that we are dealing with highdimensional settings. The second part assumes sparsity and boundedness of the matrices $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}$. We list two examples for the matrices $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}$ that satisfy Condition (C8). The first is $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha} = \tilde{e}_i$, where \tilde{e}_i is an n-dimensional row vector whose ith element is 1, and 0 otherwise. In this case, $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) = (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_{0i})$. The second is $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha} = I_{n\times n}$, where $I_{n\times n}$ denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix. In this case, $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) = (\hat{\alpha}_1 - \alpha_{01}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_n - \alpha_{0n})^{\top}$, containing all out-degree parameters.

The high-dimensional central limit theorem for $\widehat{\alpha}$ and $\widehat{\beta}$ is presented below.

Theorem 3. Suppose that Conditions (C1)-(C8) hold, and there exist some constants $0 < \sigma_{\epsilon L}^2 < \sigma_{\epsilon U}^2 < \infty$ such that $\sigma_{\epsilon L}^2 < \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{ij}^2) = \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 < \sigma_{\epsilon U}^2$ for all $i, j \in [n]$, where ϵ_{ij} is defined in (2.1). If

$$\frac{(\kappa + q_n)^2}{\phi m^2} \left[\sqrt{\frac{\log^5(n)}{nh^{2p_1 + 2}}} + \sqrt{n\log(n)}h^r \right] = o(1), \tag{4.2}$$

then we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{1\alpha}}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}(\widehat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) \leq x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\alpha}G_1 \leq x\right) \right| = o(1),$$
$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{1\beta}}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta_0) \leq x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\beta}G_1 \leq x\right) \right| = o(1),$$

where $G_1 \sim \mathcal{N}_{2n-1}(0, (n-1)\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 V^{-1})$, $\mathcal{L}_1^{\alpha} = (\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}, 0_{M_{1\alpha} \times (n-1)})$ and $\mathcal{L}_1^{\beta} = (0_{M_{1\beta} \times n}, \mathcal{L}_{1\beta})$. Here $0_{b_1 \times b_2}$ denotes a $b_1 \times b_2$ zero matrix.

When κ , q_n , ϕ and m are constants, (4.2) implies that h satisfies $nh^{2(p_1+1)}/\log^2(n) \to \infty$ and $n\log(n)h^{2r} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. To achieve this bandwidth condition, we can set $h = O(n^{-1/d})$ for some integer $d > 2(p_1+1)$, and select r as the smallest even integer such that $r \ge d - (p_1+1)$. For example, when $p_1 = 2$, we can set d = 7 and r = 4. In practice, the bandwidth should be carefully selected to balance the trade-off between the bias and variance of \hat{Y}_{ij} . To enhance the feasibility of the proposed method, we develop a data-driven procedure for selecting bandwidth h in Section 7.

Define $Q = (Q_1^{\top}, \dots, Q_n^{\top})^{\top}$, where $Q_i = (Q_{i1}, \dots, Q_{i,i-1}, Q_{i,i+1}, \dots, Q_{in})^{\top}$ and $Q_{ij} = Y_{ij} - \mathbb{E}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij1}, Z_{ij})$. Let $\sigma_Q^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}Q_{ij}^2$.

Theorem 4. Suppose that Conditions (C1)-(C8) hold, and there exist some constants $0 < \sigma_{QL}^2 < \sigma_{QU}^2 < \infty$ such that $\sigma_{QL}^2 < \mathbb{E}(Q_{ij}^2) = \sigma_Q^2 < \sigma_{QU}^2$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. If

$$\frac{(\kappa + q_n)^2}{\phi m^2} \left[\sqrt{\frac{\log^5(n)}{n^2 h^{2p_1 + 2}}} + \sqrt{n^2 \log n} h^r \right] = o(1), \tag{4.3}$$

then we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_2}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{N} \mathcal{L}_2(\widehat{\eta} - \eta_0) \le x \right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_2 G_2 \le x \right) \right| = o(1),$$

where $G_2 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(0, \sigma_Q^2[\mathbb{E}(Z^\top DZ/N)]^{-1}).$

Remark 1. Compared with Graham (2017) and Yan et al. (2019), there are two significant differences in results. First, Theorem 3 concerns a high-dimensional central limit theorem, while the asymptotic distribution in Yan et al. (2019) is constructed on a fixed-dimensional subvector of $\hat{\theta}$. The asymptotic distributions of the estimators of the degree parameters have not been investigated in Graham (2017). Second, the central limit theorem for homophily parameters in Graham (2017) and Yan et al. (2019) contains an asymptotic bias due to the incidental parameter problem for likelihood inference (Neyman & Scott, 1948; Fernández-Val & Weidner, 2016). Here, $\hat{\gamma}$ is unbiased, due to the projection technique.

The variance of G_1 in Theorem 3 involves the inverse of $V = U^{\top}U$, whose explicit expression is given in (B.2) of the Supplementary Material. In addition, the variance of G_1 includes the variance σ_{ϵ}^2 of ϵ . It is unknown but can be estimated by $\hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\neq i}^n \hat{\epsilon}_{ij}^2$, where $\hat{\epsilon}_{ij} = \hat{Y}_{ij} - \hat{\alpha}_i - \hat{\beta}_j - Z_{ij}^{\top} \hat{\eta}$.

We now estimate the unknown parameter σ_Q^2 in the covariance matrix of G_2 . We consider the following estimator: $\hat{\sigma}_Q^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i}^n \hat{Q}_{ij}^2$, where $\hat{Q}_{ij} = \hat{Y}_{ij} - \hat{\mathbb{E}}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij1}, Z_{ij})$. Here, $\hat{\mathbb{E}}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij1}, Z_{ij})$ is a nonparametric estimator of $\mathbb{E}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij1}, Z_{ij})$. We adopt the Nadaraya-Watson type estimator, that is,

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij1} = x, \widetilde{Z}_{ij1} = z_1, \widetilde{Z}_{ij2} = z_2) = \frac{\sum_{1 \le i \ne j \le n} \widehat{Y}_{ij} \mathcal{K}_{xz,h}(X_{ij1} - x, \widetilde{Z}_{ij1} - z_1) \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{Z}_{ij2} = z_2)}{\sum_{1 \le i \ne j \le n} \mathcal{K}_{xz,h}(X_{ij1} - x, \widetilde{Z}_{ij1} - z_1) \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{Z}_{ij2} = z_2)},$$

where \widetilde{Z}_{ij1} and \widetilde{Z}_{ij2} are defined in Section 3.

The following theorem establishes consistency of the Gaussian approximation when replacing $\mathbb{E}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij1}, Z_{ij})$ with $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}(Y_{ij}|X_{ij1}, Z_{ij})$.

Theorem 5. If the conditions in Theorem 3 hold, then we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{1\alpha}}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}(\widehat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) \le x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\alpha}\widehat{G}_1 \le x\right) \right| = o(1),$$
$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{1\beta}}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta_0) \le x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\beta}\widehat{G}_1 \le x\right) \right| = o(1),$$

where $\widehat{G}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}_{2n-1}(0, (n-1)\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^2 V^{-1})$. In addition, if conditions in Theorem 4 hold, then we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_2}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\sqrt{N} \mathcal{L}_2(\widehat{\eta} - \eta_0) \le x \right) - \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{L}_2 \widehat{G}_2 \le x \right) \right| = o(1),$$

where $\widehat{G}_2 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(0, \widehat{\sigma}_Q^2 (Z^\top D Z/N)^{-1}).$

Remark 2. The above theorem can be used to construct For example, if we set $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha} = \tilde{e}_i$ $(i \in [n])$ and $M_{1\alpha} = 1$, then $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n-1}(\widehat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_{0i}) \leq x) - \mathbb{P}(\widehat{G}_{1i} \leq x) \right| \to 0$ by Theorem 5, where \widehat{G}_{1i} is the ith element of \widehat{G}_1 . Let $z_{i,1-\nu/2}$ be the upper $(\nu/2)$ -quantile of the distribution \widehat{G}_{1i} , Then, we can construct the point-wise $(1-\nu)$ confidence interval for each α_{0i} by $[\widehat{\alpha}_i - z_{i,1-\nu/2}/\sqrt{n-1}, \widehat{\alpha}_i + z_{i,1-\nu/2}/\sqrt{n-1}]$. In addition, if we are interested in constructing confidence intervals for $\alpha_{0i} - \alpha_{0j}$ for any pair (i, j), we can set $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha} = \widetilde{e}_{ij}$ $(1 \leq i \neq j \leq n)$ and $M_{1\alpha} = 1$. Theorem 5 implies that $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n-1}[\widehat{\alpha}_i - \widehat{\alpha}_j - (\alpha_{0i} - \alpha_{0j})] \leq x) - \mathbb{P}(\widehat{G}_{1i} - \widehat{G}_{1j} \leq x)| \to 0$. Let $z_{ij,1-\nu/2}$ be the upper $(\nu/2)$ -quantile of the distribution $(\widehat{G}_{1i} - \widehat{G}_{1j})$. Then, the pairwise confidence interval for $(\alpha_{0i} - \alpha_{0j})$ is $[\widehat{\alpha}_i - \widehat{\alpha}_j - z_{ij,1-\nu/2}/\sqrt{n-1}, \widehat{\alpha}_i - \widehat{\alpha}_j + z_{ij,1-\nu/2}/\sqrt{n-1}]$. Similarly, we can obtain the confidence intervals for β_{0i} and $\beta_{0i} - \beta_{0j}$ by setting $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta} = \widetilde{e}_{n+i}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta} = \widetilde{e}_{n+i,n+j}$.

5 Applications

This section presents several concrete applications of Theorem 5. Specifically, we consider the following applications: (i) testing for sparse signals; (ii) support recovery and (iii) testing the existence of the degree heterogeneity.

5.1 Testing for sparse signals

In this section, we focus on testing the following hypotheses:

$$H_{0\alpha,S}: \alpha_{0i} = 0 \text{ for all } i \in [n] \quad \text{versus} \quad H_{1\alpha,S}: \alpha_{0i} \neq 0 \text{ for some } i \in [n];$$

$$H_{0\beta,S}: \beta_{0i} = 0 \text{ for all } i \in [n-1] \quad \text{versus} \quad H_{1\beta,S}: \beta_{0i} \neq 0 \text{ for some } i \in [n-1].$$

Let $\widehat{\zeta}_{i,S}$ be the *i*th diagonal element of $(n-1)\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^2 S$. To test $H_{0\alpha,S}$, the matrix $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}$ is given by $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha,S} = \operatorname{diag}\{1/\widehat{\zeta}_{1,S}^{1/2}, \ldots, 1/\widehat{\zeta}_{n,S}^{1/2}\}$ with $M_{1\alpha} = n$, and $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha,S}(\widehat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) = (\widehat{\alpha}_1/\widehat{\zeta}_{1,S}^{1/2}, \ldots, \widehat{\alpha}_n/\widehat{\zeta}_{n,S}^{1/2})^{\top}$ under $H_{0\alpha}$. To test $H_{0\beta,S}$, we take $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}$ as $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta,S} = \operatorname{diag}\{1/\widehat{\zeta}_{n+1,S}^{1/2}, \ldots, 1/\widehat{\zeta}_{2n-1,S}^{1/2}\}$ with $M_{1\beta} = n-1$. Then, $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta_0) = (\widehat{\beta}_1/\widehat{\zeta}_{n+1,S}^{1/2}, \ldots, \widehat{\beta}_{n-1}/\widehat{\zeta}_{2n-1,S}^{1/2})^{\top}$ under $H_{0\beta,S}$.

We consider the following test statistics for $H_{0\alpha,S}$ and $H_{0\beta,S}$, respectively:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,S} = \max_{1 \le i \le n} \sqrt{n-1} |\widehat{\alpha}_i| / \widehat{\zeta}_{i,S}^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\beta,S} = \max_{1 \le i \le n-1} \sqrt{n-1} |\widehat{\beta}_i| / \widehat{\zeta}_{n+i,S}^{1/2}$$

The test statistics $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,S}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,S}$ are close to zero under the nulls $H_{0\alpha}$ and $H_{0\beta,S}$. Therefore, we reject $H_{0\alpha,S}$ if $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha} > c_{\alpha,S}(\nu)$, and reject $H_{0\beta}$ if $\mathcal{T}_{\beta} > c_{\beta,S}(\nu)$, where $c_{\alpha,S}(\nu)$ and $c_{\beta,S}(\nu)$ are the critical values. Based on Theorem 5, we can use a resampling method to obtain the critical values. Specifically, we repeatedly generate normal random samples from \widehat{G}_1 , and obtain $c_{\alpha,S}(\nu)$ and $c_{\beta,S}(\nu)$ by using the empirical distribution of $\|\mathcal{L}_{1S}^{\alpha}\widehat{G}_1\|_{\infty}$ and $\|\mathcal{L}_{1S}^{\beta}\widehat{G}_1\|_{\infty}$, where $\mathcal{L}_{1S}^{\alpha} = (\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha,S}, 0_{M_{1\alpha}\times(n-1)})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{1S}^{\beta} = (\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha,S}, 0_{M_{1\alpha}\times(n-1)})$ $(0_{M_{1\beta}\times n}, \mathcal{L}_{1\beta,S})$. From Theorem 5, we have that the proposed test is of level ν asymptotically.

We now consider the (asymptotic) power analysis of the procedure above. For this, define the separation sets: $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,S}(c) = \{\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)^\top : \max_{i \in [n]} |\alpha_{0i}| / \zeta_{i,S}^{1/2} > c\sqrt{\log(n)/(n-1)}\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\beta,S}(c) = \{\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{n-1}, 0)^\top : \max_{i \in [n-1]} |\beta_{0i}| / \zeta_{n+i,S}^{1/2} > c\sqrt{\log(n-1)/(n-1)}\}$, where $\zeta_{i,S}$ is the *i*th element of $(n-1)\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 V^{-1}$.

Proposition 1. Under the conditions in Theorem 5, we have for any $\lambda_0 > 0$,

$$\inf_{\substack{\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{U}_{\alpha,S}(\sqrt{2}+\lambda_0)}} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in [n]} \sqrt{n-1} |\widehat{\alpha}_i| / \widehat{\zeta}_{i,S}^{1/2} > c_{\alpha,S}(\nu)\right) \to 1,$$

and
$$\inf_{\beta_0 \in \mathcal{U}_{\beta,S}(\sqrt{2}+\lambda_0)} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in [n-1]} \sqrt{n-1} |\widehat{\beta}_i| / \widehat{\zeta}_{n+i,S}^{1/2} > c_{\beta,S}(\nu)\right) \to 1 \quad as \quad n \to \infty.$$

Proposition 1 states that the proposed test can be triggered even when only a single entry of α has a magnitude larger than $(\sqrt{2} + \lambda_0)\sqrt{\log(n)/(n-1)}$. Consequently, the proposed test is sensitive to the detection of sparse alternatives.

5.2 Support recovery

Denote $S_{0\alpha} = \{j \in [n] : \alpha_{0j} \neq 0\}$ and $S_{0\beta} = \{j \in [n-1] : \beta_{0j} \neq 0\}$ as the supports of α_0 and β_0 , respectively. Let $s_{0\alpha} = |S_{0\alpha}|$ and $s_{0\beta} = |S_{0\beta}|$. When the null hypothesis $H_{0\alpha,S}$ and $H_{0\beta,S}$ are rejected, recovering the supports $S_{0\alpha}$ and $S_{0\beta}$ is of great interest in practice. Our support recovery procedure uses a proper threshold t in the set

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha}(t) = \left\{ i \in [n] : |\widehat{\alpha}_{i}| > \sqrt{t\widehat{\zeta}_{i,S}\log(n)/(n-1)} \right\},$$
$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\beta}(t) = \left\{ i \in [n-1] : |\widehat{\beta}_{i}| > \sqrt{t\widehat{\zeta}_{n+i,S}\log(n-1)/(n-1)} \right\}.$$

In Proposition 2, we show that the above support recovery procedure is consistent if the threshold value is set as t = 2. Proposition 2 also justifies the optimality of t = 2. For this, define $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha}(t_0) = \{\alpha : \min_{i \in \mathcal{S}_{0\alpha}} |\alpha_i| / \zeta_{i,S}^{1/2} > t_0 \sqrt{\log(n)/(n-1)}\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\beta}(t_0) = \{\beta : \min_{i \in \mathcal{S}_{0\beta}} |\beta_i| / \zeta_{n+i,S}^{1/2} > t_0 \sqrt{\log(n-1)/(n-1)}\}$. Let $\mathcal{G}^*_{\alpha} = \{\alpha : \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}\{\alpha_i \neq 0\} = s_{0\alpha}\}$ and $\mathcal{G}^*_{\beta} = \{\beta : \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{I}\{\beta_i \neq 0\} = s_{0\beta}\}$ be the class of s_0 -sparse.

Proposition 2. Under the conditions in Theorem 5, we have that

$$\inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{G}_{\alpha}(2\sqrt{2})} \mathbb{P}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha}(2) = \mathcal{S}_{0\alpha}\big) \to 1 \quad and \quad \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{G}_{\beta}(2\sqrt{2})} \mathbb{P}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\beta}(2) = \mathcal{S}_{0\beta}\big) \to 1.$$

Moreover, if $s_{0\alpha} = o(n)$ and $s_{0\beta} = o(n)$, then for any 0 < t < 2,

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{G}^*_{\alpha}} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\alpha}(t) = \mathcal{S}_{0\alpha}) \to 0 \quad and \quad \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{G}^*_{\beta}} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{\beta}(t) = \mathcal{S}_{0\beta}) \to 0.$$

The first part of Proposition 2 shows the consistency of the proposed support recovery method. That is, with probability tending to 1, $\widehat{S}_{\alpha}(2)$ and $\widehat{S}_{\beta}(2)$ can accurately recover the supports $S_{0\alpha}$ and $S_{0\beta}$ uniformly on the collection $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha}(2\sqrt{2})$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\beta}(2\sqrt{2})$, respectively. The second part of Proposition 2 states the optimality of t = 2. In other words, if the threshold parameter t is set to be less than 2, then there are zero entries of α_0 and β_0 retained in $\widehat{S}_{\alpha}(t)$ and $\widehat{S}_{\beta}(t)$, leading to an overfitting phenomenon.

5.3 Testing for degree heterogeneity

Degree heterogeneity is an important feature of real-world networks. However, it is not always clear whether a network exhibits degree heterogeneity or not. Therefore, we consider the following hypotheses:

 $\begin{aligned} H_{0\alpha,D} : \alpha_{0i} &= \alpha_{0j} \text{ for all } i, j \in \mathcal{G}_1 \text{ versus } H_{1\alpha,D} : \alpha_{0i} \neq \alpha_{0,j} \text{ for some } i, j \in \mathcal{G}_1; \\ H_{0\beta,D} : \beta_{0i} &= \beta_{0,j} \text{ for all } i, j \in \mathcal{G}_2 \text{ versus } H_{1\beta,D} : \beta_{0i} \neq \beta_{0,i+1} \text{ for some } i \in \mathcal{G}_2, \end{aligned}$

where \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are some prespecified subsets of [n] and [n-1], respectively. If $H_{0\alpha,D}$ holds, then the observed network does not exhibit out-degree heterogeneity, while under $H_{0\beta,D}$, it does not exhibit in-degree heterogeneity. To test $H_{0\alpha,D}$ and $H_{0\beta,D}$, we can apply the following test statistics:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,D} = \max_{i < j \in \mathcal{G}_1} \sqrt{n-1} |\widehat{\alpha}_i - \widehat{\alpha}_j| / \widehat{\zeta}_{ij,D}^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\beta,D} = \max_{i < j \in \mathcal{G}_2} \sqrt{n-1} |\widehat{\beta}_i - \widehat{\beta}_j| / \widehat{\zeta}_{n+i,n+j,D}^{1/2}$$

where $\widehat{\zeta}_{ij,D} = e_{ij}[(n-1)\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}S]e_{ij}^{\top}$ and $e_{ij} = e_{i} - e_{j}$. However, tests $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,D}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\beta,D}$ are computationally intensive. To overcome this issue, we consider a simple test for nulls. Specifically, define $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha} = \mathcal{L}_{1\alpha,D}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta} = \mathcal{L}_{1\beta,D}$, where the *i*th row of $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha,D}$ $(i \in [n-1])$ and $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta,D}$ $(i \in [n-2])$ are $\widetilde{e}_{i} - \widetilde{e}_{i+1}$. Then, we have $\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha,D}(\widehat{\alpha} - \alpha_{0}) = (\widehat{\alpha}_{1} - \widehat{\alpha}_{2}, \dots, \widehat{\alpha}_{n-1} - \widehat{\alpha}_{n})^{\top}$ under the null $H_{0\alpha,D}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{1\beta,D}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta_{0}) = (\widehat{\beta}_{1} - \widehat{\beta}_{2}, \dots, \widehat{\beta}_{n-2} - \widehat{\beta}_{n-1})^{\top}$ under the null $H_{0\beta,D}$. Further define

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D} = \max_{i \in \mathcal{G}_1} \sqrt{n-1} |\widehat{\alpha}_i - \widehat{\alpha}_{i+1}| / \widehat{\zeta}_{i,D}^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\beta,D} = \max_{i \in \mathcal{G}_2} \sqrt{n-1} |\widehat{\beta}_i - \widehat{\beta}_{i+1}| / \widehat{\zeta}_{n+i,D}^{1/2}$$

where $\widehat{\zeta}_{i,D} = e_{i,i+1}[(n-1)\widehat{\sigma}^2 S]e_{i,i+1}^{\top}$.

Based on $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}$, the proposed tests are defined as follows. First, we rearrange the index of the nodes and recalculate the tests $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}$. Then, repeat this procedure \widetilde{M} times. Here, \widetilde{M} is a prespecified constant. Finally, we obtain the tests $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(\widetilde{M})$ using

$$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M}) = \max_{1 \le s \le \widetilde{M}} \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}^s \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(\widetilde{M}) = \max_{1 \le s \le \widetilde{M}} \mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}^s,$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}^s$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}^s$ denote the tests $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}$ calculated at the *s*th replication, respectively. We can observe that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(\widetilde{M})$ are close to zero under the nulls $H_{0\alpha,D}$ and $H_{0\beta,D}$, respectively. Therefore, we reject $H_{0\alpha,D}$ if $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M}) > c_{\alpha,D}(v)$, and reject $H_{0\beta,D}$ if $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(\widetilde{M}) > c_{\beta,D}(v)$, where $c_{\alpha,D}(v)$ and $c_{\beta,D}(v)$ are the critical values. In practice, $c_{\alpha,D}(v)$ and $c_{\beta,D}(v)$ can be obtained by using a resampling method discussed in Section 5.1.

Remark 3. It should be noted that the tests $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(\widetilde{M})$ may lose power compared with $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,D}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\beta,D}$. However, our simulation studies show that the tests $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(\widetilde{M})$ with $\widetilde{M} = 3$ may be comparable with $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\alpha,D}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\beta,D}$. A more detailed comparison of these tests is presented in Section 7.3.

6 Extensions

In the previous sections, we study semiparametric inference under the assumption that the distribution of ε_{ij} is independent of X_{ij} and edges are binary. In some cases, ε_{ij} may depend on the covariates and edges may take weighted values. In this section, we present two extensions of the proposed model to accommodate these two situations.

6.1 Extension to conditionally independent cases

We relax Condition (C3) as follows.

Condition (C3'). The conditional density function of ε_{ij} satisfies $f_{\varepsilon}(\varepsilon_{ij}|X_{ij1}, Z_{ij}) = f_{\varepsilon}(\varepsilon_{ij}|Z_{ij})$. In addition, $\mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_{ij}|Z_{ij}) = 0$ almost surely.

Condition (C3') assumes that ε_{ij} is conditionally independent of X_{ij1} , but it can depend on Z_{ij} . Define $\widehat{\text{Cov}(\epsilon)} = \text{diag}\{\widehat{\epsilon}_1^{\top}, \ldots, \widehat{\epsilon}_n^{\top}\}$, and $\widehat{\text{Cov}(Q)} = \text{diag}\{\widehat{Q}_1^{\top}, \ldots, \widehat{Q}_n^{\top}\}$, where $\widehat{\epsilon}_i = (\widehat{\epsilon}_{i1}, \ldots, \widehat{\epsilon}_{i,i-1}, \widehat{\epsilon}_{i,i+1}, \ldots, \widehat{\epsilon}_{in})^{\top}$ and $\widehat{Q}_i = (\widehat{Q}_{i1}, \ldots, \widehat{Q}_{i,i-1}, \widehat{Q}_{i,i+1}, \ldots, \widehat{Q}_{in})^{\top}$. The following theorem extends the results of Theorem 5. **Theorem 6.** Suppose that Conditions (C1)-(C2), (C3') and (C4)-(C8) hold, and there exist some constants $0 < \sigma_{\epsilon L}^2 < \sigma_{\epsilon U}^2 < \infty$ such that $\sigma_{\epsilon L}^2 < \mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{ij}^2) < \sigma_{\epsilon U}^2$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. In addition, if the condition (4.2) in Theorem 3 holds, then we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{1\alpha}}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}(\widehat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) \le x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\alpha}\widehat{G}_3 \le x\right) \right| = o(1),$$
$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{1\beta}}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta_0) \le x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\beta}\widehat{G}_3 \le x\right) \right| = o(1),$$

where $\widehat{G}_3 \sim \mathcal{N}_{2n-1}(0, (n-1)SU^{\top} \widehat{Cov(\epsilon)}US)$. Moreover, if there exist some constants $0 < \sigma_{QL}^2 < \sigma_{QU}^2 < \infty$ such that $\sigma_{QL}^2 < \mathbb{E}(Q_{ij}^2) < \sigma_{QU}^2$ for all $i, j \in [n]$, and the condition (4.3) in Theorem 4 holds, then we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{C}\in\mathbb{R}^{M_2}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{N}\mathcal{L}_2(\widehat{\eta}-\eta_0) \le x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_2\widehat{G}_4 \le x\right) \right| = o(1),$$

where $\widehat{G}_4 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(0, N(Z^\top DZ)^{-1}Z^\top D\widehat{Cov(Q)}DZ(Z^\top DZ)^{-1}).$

x

Based on the theorem above, the inference methods developed in Section 5 can also be extended to the parameters α_0 and β_0 by for example, replacing $(n-1)\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^2 S$ in \widehat{G}_1 with $(n-1)SU^{\top}\widehat{\text{Cov}(\epsilon)}US$ in \widehat{G}_3 . Details are omitted here to save space.

6.2 Extension to weighted networks

We generalize the proposed method to analyze the weighted network data. For this purpose, we consider the following model:

$$A_{ij} = \sum_{l=0}^{R-1} \pi_l \mathbb{I}(\omega_{0l} < \alpha_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + X_{ij1} + Z_{ij}^\top \eta_0 - \varepsilon_{ij} \le \omega_{0,l+1}),$$
(6.1)

where R is a specified constant, π_l (l = 0, 1, ..., R - 1) denote the weights, and $\omega_{00} < \omega_{01} < \cdots < \omega_{0R}$ are unknown threshold parameters. We set $\omega_{00} = -\infty$ and $\omega_{0,R} = \infty$. Under model (6.1), we have $A_{ij} \in {\pi_0, \pi_1, ..., \pi_{R-1}}$, and $A_{ij} = \pi_l$ if $\alpha_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + X_{ij1} + Z_{ij}^{\top} \eta_0 - \varepsilon_{ij} \in (\omega_{0l}, \omega_{0,l+1}]$. For the identification of model (6.1), we assume $\alpha_{0n} = \beta_{0n} = 0$. Subsequently, using arguments similar to those in the proof of Theorem 1, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{ijl}|Z_{ij}) = -\omega_{0l} + \alpha_{0i} + \beta_{0j} + Z_{ij}^{\top}\eta_0, \quad l \in [R-1],$$
(6.2)

where $Y_{ijl} = [\mathbb{I}(A_{ij} \ge \pi_l) - \mathbb{I}(X_{ij1} > 0)]/f(X_{ij1}|Z_{ij})$. Let $\omega = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{R-1})^\top$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1})^\top$ without α_n , and β and η are defined as previously. Furthermore, let $\omega_0, \alpha_0, \beta_0$ and η_0 denote true values. Define $\widehat{Y}_{ijl} = [\mathbb{I}(A_{ij} \ge \pi_l) - \mathbb{I}(X_{ij1} > 0)]/\widehat{f}(X_{ij1}|Z_{ij})$. Let $\widetilde{Y} = \mathbb{1}_R \otimes Y$, $\widetilde{Z} = (\mathbb{I}_R \otimes \mathbb{1}_N, \mathbb{1}_R \otimes Z)$ and $\widetilde{U} = \mathbb{1}_R \otimes \overline{U}$, where $\mathbb{1}_C$ denotes a *C*-dimensional vector of ones and \overline{U} is obtained by deleting the *i*th column of *U*. With some abuse of notation, we define $D = I_{RN} - \widetilde{U}(\widetilde{U}^\top \widetilde{U})^{-1}\widetilde{U}^\top$. By (6.2) and the conditions $\alpha_{0n} = 0$, $\beta_{0n} = 0$ and $\gamma_{01} = 1$, we can show that $\widetilde{Z}^\top D\mathbb{E}(\widetilde{Y}|\widetilde{Z}) = \widetilde{Z}^\top D\widetilde{Z}\eta_0$. This implies that we can estimate η_0 by $\widehat{\eta} = (\widetilde{Z}^\top D\widetilde{Z})^{-1}\widetilde{Z}^\top D\widehat{Y}$. Then, we can obtain the least squares estimators $\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}$ and $\widehat{\omega}$ for α_0, β_0 and ω_0 by minimizing

$$\sum_{l=1}^{R-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i} (\widehat{Y}_{ijl} - \alpha_i - \beta_j + \omega_l - Z_{ij}^{\top} \widehat{\eta})^2 \text{ subject to } \alpha_n = 0 \text{ and } \beta_n = 0$$

Define $\widehat{\sigma}_{w\epsilon}^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} (\check{Y}_{ij} + \widetilde{\omega} - \widehat{\alpha}_i - \widehat{\beta}_j - Z_{ij}^\top \widehat{\eta})^2$, and $\widehat{\sigma}_{wQ,l}^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} [\widehat{Y}_{ijl} - \widehat{\mathbb{E}}(Y_{ijl} | X_{ij1}, Z_{ij1})]^2$, where $\check{Y}_{ij} = \sum_{l=1}^{R-1} \widehat{Y}_{ijl} / (R-1)$ and $\widetilde{\omega} = \sum_{l=1}^{R-1} \widehat{\omega}_l / (R-1)$. Furthermore, define $\widehat{\Omega} = \text{diag}\{\widehat{\Omega}_1^\top, \ldots, \widehat{\Omega}_R^\top\}$, where $\widehat{\Omega}_l = \widehat{\sigma}_{wQ,l}^2 \mathbb{1}_N$. Let $\widehat{\xi} = (\widehat{\omega}^\top, \widehat{\eta}^\top)^\top$ and $\xi_0 = (\omega_0^\top, \eta_0^\top)^\top$ be the true values.

Theorem 7. If the conditions in Theorem 3 hold, then we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{1\alpha}}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{1\alpha}(\widehat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) \le x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\alpha}\widehat{G}_5 \le x\right) \right| = o(1),$$
$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{1\beta}}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n-1}\mathcal{L}_{1\beta}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta_0) \le x\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_1^{\beta}\widehat{G}_5 \le x\right) \right| = o(1),$$

where $\widehat{G}_5 \sim \mathcal{N}_{2n-2}(0, (n-1)\widehat{\sigma}^2_{w\epsilon}S)$. In addition, if the conditions in Theorem 4 hold, then we have

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M_2}} \left| \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{N} \mathcal{L}_2(\widehat{\xi} - \xi_0) \le x \right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_2 \widehat{G}_6 \le x \right) \right| = o(1),$$

where $\widehat{G}_6 \sim \mathcal{N}_p(0, N(\widetilde{Z}^\top D\widetilde{Z})^{-1}\widetilde{Z}^\top D\widehat{\Omega}D\widetilde{Z}(\widetilde{Z}^\top D\widetilde{Z})^{-1})$ and \mathcal{L}_2 denotes an $M_2 \times (p+R-1)$ matrix.

Theorem 7 extends the results of Theorem 5 to weighted networks. The proof of Theorem 7 is omitted here because it is similar to that of Theorem 5 by treating ω_{0l} as an intercept.

7 Numerical studies

It is well known that the bandwidth has an important influence on the finite sample performance of the estimators. Motivated by Lewbel (1998), we consider the following procedure for choosing the

bandwidth h that works well in our simulation studies. Specifically, let δ be an arbitrarily specified constant. By Theorem 1, we can show that $\delta = \mathbb{E}\left\{\left[\mathbb{I}(X_{1ij} + \delta > 0) - \mathbb{I}(X_{1ij} > 0)\right]/f(X_{1ij}|Z_{ij})\right\}$. Define $\hat{\delta}(h) = N^{-1} \sum_{1 \le i \ne j \le n} \left[\mathbb{I}(X_{1ij} + \delta > 0) - \mathbb{I}(X_{1ij} > 0)\right]/\hat{f}(X_{1ij}|Z_{ij})$. Then we can obtain an estimate of h as $\hat{h} = \arg\min_h \sum_{i=1}^{M_0} (\delta_i - \hat{\delta}_i(h))^2$, where δ_i $(1 \le i \le M_0)$ are some prespecified grid points on (0, 1], and M_0 denotes a prespecified integer. In the following simulation studies, We set $\delta_i = i/M_0$ and $M_0 = 10$ in the bandwidth selection procedure.

Next, we describe the kernel function that we use. We choose the biweight product kernel to estimate the parameters, that is, $\mathcal{K}_z(z_1, \ldots, z_{p_1}) = \prod_{l=1}^{p_1} (15/16)(1-z_l^2)^2 \mathbb{I}(|z_l| \leq 1)$. An analogous biweight product kernel is also used for $\mathcal{K}_{xz}(x, z)$. The motivation for this choice is that it is computationally efficient and generally behaves well (see e.g., Härdle et al., 1992).

7.1 Evaluating asymptotic properties

In this section, we carry out simulation studies to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed methods. The covariates Z_{ij} are independently generated from a bivariate normal distribution with mean 0 and covariance $\Sigma = (\tilde{\sigma}_{ij})$. Here, we take $\tilde{\sigma}_{11} = \tilde{\sigma}_{22} = 1$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_{12} = \tilde{\sigma}_{21} = 0.25$. Then, we generate X_{ij1} by $X_{ij1} = Z_{ij}^{\top}b + E_{ij}$, where $b = (0.5, -0.5)^{\top}$ and E_{ij} are independently generated from the standard normal distribution. The directed network is simulated according to the network model in (2.1). The parameters α_{0i} are taken as $\alpha_{0i} =$ $-0.25 \log(n) + (i-1)/(n-1)[0.25 \log(n) + \rho_1 \log(n)], i \in [n]$, where ρ_1 is a parameter to control the network sparsity. We set $\beta_{0i} = \alpha_{0i}$ for $i \in [n-1]$ and $\beta_{0n} = 0$ for the identification of model (2.1). The parameter $\eta_0 = (\eta_{01}, \eta_{02})^\top = (-0.5, 0.5)^\top$. For the noise term ε_{ij} , we consider the following three settings: (i) ε_{ij} are independently generated from the standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}_1(0,1)$; (ii) ε_{ij} are independently generated from a logistic distribution with distribution function $[1 + \exp\{-(x - \mu)/\nu\}]^{-1}$ with $\mu = 0$ and $\nu = 2$, which is denoted by Logistic(0, 2); and (iii) ε_{ii} are independently generated from $\mathcal{N}_1(-0.3, 0.91)$ with probability 0.75 and $\mathcal{N}_1(0.9, 0.19)$ with probability 0.25, which is denoted by MNorm₁. The first case corresponds to the probit regression model, while the second case corresponds to a generalized logistic regression model. The last case is a mixture of normal distributions, which is designed to yield a distribution that is both skewed and bimodal but still has mean zero and variance one.

We set n = 50 and 100. The bandwidth h is selected based on a preliminary investigation, in which the proposed procedure is applied to a few simulated data sets. Under our settings, \hat{h} are 0.820 and 0.672, corresponding to n = 50 and n = 100, respectively. For each configuration, we replicated 1000 simulations.

The values of $z_{1-\nu/2}$ are obtained with 10000 bootstrap iterations. The results for α_{0j} (j =

 $1, n/2, n), \alpha_{n/5,4n/5}, \alpha_{n/2,n/2+1}$ and η_0 are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Here $\alpha_{i,j} = \alpha_{0i} - \alpha_{0j}$. The results for $\hat{\beta}$ are similar to those of $\hat{\alpha}$, which are omitted here to save space. Tables 1 and 2 report the bias (Bias) given by the sample means of the proposed estimates minus the true values, the standard deviations (SDs) that characterizes the sample variations over 1000 simulations, and the 95% empirical coverage probability (CP). We see that the proposed estimators are nearly unbiased, and the SDs decrease as the sample size increases. The 95% empirical coverage probabilities are reasonable. In addition, we compare the proposed method with Yan et al. (2019), in which the logistic assumption for ε_{ij} is imposed. The results are provided in Table 3. It suggests that the bias of the estimators obtained by Yan et al. (2019) is non-negligible when parametric distribution assumptions are violated.

Table 1: The results of bias, standard deviation (SD) and 95% empirical coverage probability (CP) of the estimators with n = 50.

		$\rho_1 = 0$			$ \rho_1 = 0.1 $				$\rho_1 = 0.2$			
ε_{ij}		Bias	SD	CP(%)	Bias	SD	CP(%)		Bias	SD	CP(%)	
$\mathcal{N}_1(0,1)$	α_{01}	0.089	0.448	94.0	0.096	0.446	93.0		0.076	0.418	93.7	
	$\alpha_0 \frac{n}{2}$	0.014	0.416	95.2	-0.010	0.396	95.2		0.011	0.384	94.8	
	α_{0n}	-0.015	0.375	97.3	-0.040	0.377	95.2		-0.048	0.388	94.2	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{E},\frac{4n}{E}}$	0.085	0.461	94.1	0.086	0.433	93.3		0.097	0.441	91.9	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{2},\frac{n}{2}+1}$	-0.014	0.450	94.1	-0.015	0.426	93.1		0.019	0.390	94.1	
	η_{01}	-0.003	0.038	93.8	0.007	0.038	94.0		0.006	0.038	93.6	
	η_{02}	0.001	0.040	94.4	-0.004	0.038	93.6		-0.006	0.036	95.2	
$\operatorname{Logistic}(0,2)$	α_{01}	0.092	0.420	92.9	0.045	0.443	91.5		0.056	0.395	92.5	
	$\alpha_{0\frac{n}{2}}$	0.009	0.388	95.7	0.009	0.364	95.9		-0.004	0.364	95.1	
	α_{0n}	-0.027	0.381	96.8	-0.018	0.343	96.1		-0.047	0.375	93.2	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{5},\frac{4n}{5}}$	0.095	0.425	94.0	0.039	0.431	93.0		0.084	0.412	92.5	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{2},\frac{n}{2}+1}$	-0.008	0.406	95.2	0.009	0.369	94.2		0.008	0.356	95.3	
	η_{01}	0.001	0.039	93.3	0.005	0.036	93.5		0.010	0.034	95.1	
	η_{02}	-0.001	0.037	93.7	-0.007	0.034	95.2		-0.009	0.035	95.1	
$Mnorm_1$	α_{01}	0.103	0.489	92.9	0.061	0.481	91.0		0.067	0.418	94.1	
	$\alpha_0 \frac{n}{2}$	0.023	0.424	95.4	0.008	0.395	95.5		-0.008	0.374	96.0	
	α_{0n}	-0.015	0.402	96.0	-0.022	0.378	96.6		-0.050	0.417	92.8	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{5},\frac{4n}{5}}$	0.089	0.448	94.3	0.070	0.428	94.4		0.095	0.453	93.6	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{2},\frac{n}{2}+1}$	0.004	0.458	95.4	-0.003	0.402	94.9		-0.009	0.383	95.3	
	η_{01}	-0.002	0.040	94.2	0.006	0.039	93.5		0.006	0.037	93.9	
	η_{02}	0.001	0.039	94.1	-0.006	0.035	95.4		-0.005	0.036	96.2	

7.2 Testing for sparse signal

In this section, we evaluate the finite sample performance of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,S}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,S}$ in testing the sparse signal. For this, we set $\alpha_{0i} = -2i/n$ if $i \in [\rho_2 n]$ and $\alpha_{0i} = 0$ otherwise. For simplicity, we set $\beta_{0i} = \alpha_{0i}$ for $i \in [n-1]$ and $\beta_{0n} = 0$ for the identification of model (2.1). We choose ρ_2

		$\rho_1 = 0$				$ \rho_1 = 0.1 $				$\rho_1 = 0.2$			
ε_{ij}		Bias	SD	CP(%)	_	Bias	SD	CP(%)		Bias	SD	CP(%)	
$\mathcal{N}_1(0,1)$	α_{01}	0.094	0.412	93.6		0.102	0.359	93.0		0.074	0.359	92.9	
	$\alpha_{0\frac{n}{2}}$	0.004	0.352	96.4		0.017	0.292	97.9		0.005	0.284	97.2	
	α_{0n}	-0.038	0.303	98.3		-0.023	0.284	97.2		-0.051	0.295	95.8	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{5},\frac{4n}{5}}$	0.080	0.432	93.6		0.086	0.364	92.5		0.069	0.360	91.7	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{2},\frac{n}{2}+1}$	0.002	0.414	94.6		0.060	0.381	93.1		0.057	0.339	94.1	
	η_{01}	-0.010	0.023	92.2		-0.001	0.022	93.4		-0.001	0.021	96.1	
	η_{02}	0.011	0.023	92.2		0.000	0.022	94.5		-0.001	0.020	96.1	
$\operatorname{Logistic}(0,2)$	α_{01}	0.094	0.401	93.1		0.067	0.346	93.1		0.073	0.332	93.9	
	$\alpha_{0\frac{n}{2}}$	0.003	0.327	97.1		-0.002	0.289	97.4		0.004	0.278	96.5	
	α_{0n}	-0.028	0.284	98.3		-0.020	0.264	97.3		-0.038	0.272	96.5	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{5},\frac{4n}{5}}$	0.092	0.401	92.6		0.056	0.358	91.7		0.058	0.323	92.0	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{2},\frac{n}{2}+1}$	0.066	0.384	94.1		0.054	0.369	92.7		0.059	0.312	94.5	
	η_{01}	-0.008	0.022	91.8		0.000	0.020	96.0		0.002	0.019	95.8	
	η_{02}	0.008	0.022	93.2		0.000	0.020	95.6		-0.002	0.019	96.1	
$Mnorm_1$	α_{01}	0.089	0.461	93.7		0.102	0.402	90.5		0.102	0.380	92.4	
	$\alpha_0 \frac{n}{2}$	0.015	0.364	97.2		-0.001	0.305	96.5		0.004	0.291	97.2	
	α_{0n}	-0.030	0.310	98.5		-0.035	0.282	97.6		-0.037	0.327	93.7	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{5},\frac{4n}{5}}$	0.074	0.394	94.7		0.093	0.353	93.0		0.064	0.367	91.8	
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{2},\frac{n}{2}+1}$	0.001	0.402	94.4		0.064	0.377	93.2		0.051	0.325	93.3	
	η_{01}	-0.007	0.024	93.9		0.000	0.022	94.0		-0.001	0.021	95.6	
	η_{02}	0.008	0.023	93.1		0.001	0.021	95.8		0.000	0.020	95.9	

Table 2: The results of bias, standard deviation (SD) and 95% empirical coverage probability (CP) of the estimators with n = 100.

from $\{0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1\}$. When $\rho_2 = 0$, the null hypotheses $H_{0\alpha,S}$ and $H_{0\beta,S}$ hold true. The departure from the null $H_{0\alpha,D}$ and $H_{0\beta,D}$ increases as ρ_2 increases from 0 to 1, while the density of the generated network decreases from 50% to 33%. The sample size is set to be n = 50, 100and 150. The level ν is taken as 0.05. The critical values are calculated using the bootstrap method with 10000 simulated realizations. For the noise term ε_{ij} , we consider the following three settings: (i) $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}_1(0, 0.25)$; (ii) $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim \text{Logistic}(0, 4)$ and (ii) ε_{ij} are independently generated from $\mathcal{N}_1(-0.3, 0.5)$ with probability 0.75 and $\mathcal{N}_1(0.9, 0.5)$ with probability 0.25. The corresponding distribution is denoted by MNorm₂. All other settings are the same as those in Section 7.1.

Figure 1 shows the empirical size and power of the test statistics $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,S}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,S}$ at the significance level 0.05. We observe that the empirical sizes of the proposed tests are close to the nominal level 0.05, and the tests have reasonable powers to detect deviations from the null hypothesis. The power of the tests increases as ρ_2 increases from 0.2 to 1. Also, the powers of the tests increase as n increases from 50 to 150.

Next, we evaluate the finite sample performance of the method developed for support recovery. For this, we set α_0 and β_0 as follows: $\alpha_0 = (-1, 2, -2, 1.5, -3, -1.5 \mathbb{1}_d^{\top}, \mathbb{0}_{n-d-5}^{\top})^{\top}$ and $\beta_0 = (\mathbb{0}_5^{\top}, -1, 2, -2, 1.5, -3, -1.5 \mathbb{1}_d^{\top}, \mathbb{0}_{n-d-10}^{\top})^{\top}$, where $d = \lfloor n/15 \rfloor$. We set n = 100 and 150. To

			a +)		. ()					
		$\mathcal{N}_1($	(0, 1)	Logist	ic(0, 2)	MN	$MNorm_1$			
ρ_1		Proposed	Yan et al.	Proposed	Yan et al.	Proposed	Yan et al.			
0	α_{01}	0.094	-0.988	0.094	-1.263	0.089	-1.088			
	α_{0n}	-0.038	-0.073	-0.028	-0.068	-0.030	-0.008			
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{5},\frac{4n}{5}}$	0.080	-0.540	0.092	-0.681	0.074	-0.638			
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{2},\frac{n}{2}+1}$	0.001	-0.441	0.066	-0.601	0.001	-0.517			
	η_{01}	-0.010	-0.414	-0.008	-0.536	-0.007	-0.487			
	η_{02}	0.011	0.416	0.008	0.536	0.008	0.486			
0.1	α_{01}	0.102	-0.917	0.067	-1.239	0.102	-0.920			
	α_{0n}	-0.023	0.275	-0.020	0.388	-0.035	0.329			
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{5},\frac{4n}{5}}$	0.086	-0.661	0.056	-0.900	0.093	-0.731			
	$\alpha_{\frac{n}{2},\frac{n}{2}+1}$	0.060	-0.535	0.054	-0.765	0.064	-0.604			
	η_{01}	-0.001	-0.389	0.000	-0.524	0.000	-0.409			
	η_{02}	0.000	0.388	0.000	0.523	0.001	0.409			

Table 3: The compared results of the bias of the estimators obtained by our method and Yan et al. (2019)'s method with n = 100.

assess the accuracy of the support recovery, we adopt the following similarity measure (Cai et al., 2013): $\mathcal{M}(\widehat{S}, \mathcal{S}_0) = |\widehat{S} \cap \mathcal{S}_0| / \sqrt{|\widehat{S}||\mathcal{S}_0|}$, where $0 \leq \mathcal{M}(\widehat{S}, \mathcal{S}_0) \leq 1$, with 0 indicating that the intersection of \widehat{S} and \mathcal{S}_0 is an empty set and 1 indicating exact recovery. A high value of $\mathcal{M}(\widehat{S}, \mathcal{S}_0)$ indicates that the support recovery is accurate. Table 4 summarizes the mean and the standard deviation of $\mathcal{M}(\widehat{S}, \mathcal{S}_0)$, as well as the numbers of false positives (FP) and false negatives (FN) based on 1000 replications. The results in Table 4 show that $\mathcal{M}(\widehat{S}_{\alpha}(2), \mathcal{S}_{0\alpha})$ tends to approach one as *n* increases. In addition, the values of false positives and false negative are not very high, and decrease as *n* increases.

Table 4: The mean and standard deviation (SD) of $\mathcal{M}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{S}_0)$, and the numbers of false positives (FP) and false negatives (FN).

			a	² 0		β_0				
$arepsilon_{ij}$	n	Mean	SD	\mathbf{FP}	FN	_	Mean	SD	\mathbf{FP}	$_{\rm FN}$
N(0, 0.25)	n = 100	0.978	0.057	0.229	0.281		0.977	0.056	0.264	0.264
	n = 150	0.989	0.051	0.207	0.129		0.986	0.056	0.230	0.108
$\operatorname{Logistic}(0,4)$	n = 100	0.977	0.062	0.377	0.263		0.979	0.060	0.317	0.255
	n = 150	0.992	0.021	0.220	0.048		0.992	0.019	0.190	0.056
$Mnorm_2$	n = 100	0.962	0.071	0.350	0.568		0.957	0.076	0.383	0.585
	n = 150	0.984	0.064	0.262	0.241		0.983	0.059	0.233	0.224



Figure 1: Empirical size and power of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,S}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,S}$.

7.3 Testing for degree heterogeneity

In this section, we evaluate the finite sample performance of the tests $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(\widetilde{M})$ in testing the existence of degree heterogeneity. For this, we consider $\mathcal{G}_1 = [n]$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = [n-1]$. Let $\alpha_{0i} = -\rho_3 i/n$ for $i \in [n]$, $\beta_{0i} = \alpha_{0i}$ for $i \in [n-1]$ and $\beta_{0n} = 0$. Under these settings, $|\alpha_{0i} - \alpha_{0,i+1}| = \rho_3/n$ but $\max_{1 \le i < j \le n} |\alpha_{0i} - \alpha_{0,j}| = \rho_3(1-1/n)$. Here, we choose $\widetilde{M} = 0, 1, 2$ and 3, and $\rho_3 = 0, 0.2, 0.4$ and 0.6. Note that $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(0)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(0)$ are identical to the tests $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}$, respectively, and may not be sensitive to the signals $|\alpha_{0i} - \alpha_{0,i+1}| = \rho_3/n$ and $|\beta_{0i} - \beta_{0,i+1}| = \rho_3/n$. In addition, $H_{0\alpha,D}$ and $H_{0\beta,D}$ hold true when $\rho_3 = 0$. The other settings are the same as those used previously.

The results for $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ are summarized in Figure 2. The results for $\mathcal{T}_{\beta,D}(\widetilde{M})$ are similar and are omitted here to save space. We see that the empirical sizes of all tests are close to the nominal level 0.05. However, the test $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}$ has nearly no power, and hence, fails to detect deviations from the null hypothesis. Figure 2 also suggests that the test $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ with $\widetilde{M} \geq 2$ significantly improves the performance of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}$ in terms of the power estimation, and the power of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ increases when \widetilde{M} increases from 0 to 3. However, $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(2)$ is comparable with $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(3)$. Figure S1 in the Supplemental Material shows that the time required to calculate the test $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ may increases with \widetilde{M} in a linear rate. When n = 150 and $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.25)$, the time required to calculate $\widetilde{T}_{\alpha,D}$ is approximately 450 seconds for each replication. We also construct simulation studies to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed method for the conditionally independent cases and



Figure 2: Empirical size and power of $\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,D}(\widetilde{M})$ with $\widetilde{M} = 0, 1, 2$ and 3.

weighted networks. The results are summarized in the section C of the Supplemental Material, which suggest that the proposed method works well.

7.4 Real data analysis

The Lazegai⁻s data of lawyers comes from a network study of corporate law partnership carried out in a Northeastern U.S. corporate law firm between 1988 and 1991 in New England (Lazega, 2001). The data set contains 71 attorneys, including partners and associates of this firm. In the following, we analyze the friendship network among these attorneys, who were asked to name the attorneys whom they socialized with outside of work. In addition, several covariates were collected for each attorney. However, to avoid the curse of dimensionality issue, we only consider the following three covariates: gender (male and female), years with the firm and age, respectively. Prior to our analysis, years with the firm and age are normalized by subtracting the average and dividing by the standard error. As in Yan et al. (2019), we define the covariate for each pair as the absolute difference between the continuous variables and indicators of whether the categorical variables are equal. Since Yan et al. (2019) shows that the effect of age on network formation is significantly negative, we set age as the special regressor X_{ij1} and $\gamma_{01} = -1$ for identification.

In the data set, individuals are labeled from 1 to 71. After removing the individuals whose in-degrees or out-degrees is zero, we analyze the remaining 63 vertices. We set $\beta_{71} = 0$ as the

reference. The bandwidth is selected using the procedure developed above, while the kernel is the biweight kernel. As shown in Figure 3, $\hat{h} = 0.7651$ yields the smallest prediction error.

We first conduct the testing procedures outlined in Section 5.1 to assess whether the degree parameters α_{0i} and β_{0j} are equal to zero. The resulting p-values are less than 0.001 for testing $\alpha_{0i} = 0, i = 1, ..., n$ and 0.021 for testing $\beta_{0i} = 0, i = 1, ..., n$. This implies that there is degree heterogeneity for both out- and in-degrees at the nominal level 0.05. We then apply the support recovery procedure to identify the nonzero signals. The nonzero out-degree parameters are reported in Table 5. Two nodes "11" and "35" have nonzero in-degree parameters with their respective estimates 0.661 and 0.732.

We also implement the procedure described in Section 5.3 to test the existence of degree heterogeneity. The p-values from testing both α_{0i} and β_{0i} are less than 0.001, indicating that the lawyers' friendship network presents degree heterogeneity.

For homophily effects, the estimated coefficient of gender is 0.112 with confidence interval [0.017, 0.207] and the coefficient for years with the firm is -0.219 with confidence interval [-0.267, -0.053]. Thus, the effect of gender on lawyer's friendship preferences is positive, suggesting that they are more likely to be friend individuals of the same gender. In addition, the effect of years with the firm has a negative effect on network formation, which indicates that the larger the difference between two lawyers⁻₁ years with the firm, the less likely they are friends. These results are consistent with the findings reported by Yan et al. (2019).

Table 5: Estimation results of the selected degree parameters in the real data analysis. Here, CI denotes the pointwise 95% confidence interval.

ID	$\widehat{\alpha}_i$	CI	ID	$\widehat{\alpha}_i$	CI	ID	$\widehat{\alpha}_i$	CI
1	0.641	[0.230, 1.053]	20	0.729	[0.317, 1.140]	40	1.010	[0.598, 1.421]
2	0.695	[0.284, 1.106]	22	0.872	[0.460, 1.283]	43	0.664	[0.253, 1.075]
3	1.120	[0.709, 1.532]	25	0.695	[0.284, 1.106]	45	0.864	[0.453, 1.276]
8	0.839	[0.428, 1.251]	27	0.632	[0.221, 1.044]	47	0.868	[0.456, 1.279]
10	1.058	[0.647, 1.470]	29	1.043	[0.632, 1.454]	50	0.607	[0.196, 1.018]
11	1.094	[0.682, 1.505]	35	1.037	[0.626, 1.448]	56	1.493	[1.082, 1.905]
12	1.052	[0.640, 1.463]	37	0.624	[0.213, 1.036]	57	1.117	[0.706, 1.528]
15	1.200	[0.788, 1.611]	38	0.748	[0.337, 1.160]	58	1.168	[0.756, 1.579]
18	0.691	[0.280, 1.102]	39	0.820	[0.409, 1.232]			



Figure 3: Prediction errors versus bandwidths. The optimal bandwidth is $\hat{h} = 0.7651$.

8 Conclusions

We propose a semiparametric model for network formation to analyze effects of homophily and degree heterogeneity. The model is flexible in practice because it leaves the distribution of the latent random variables unspecified. We develop a kernel-based least squares method to estimate unknown parameters and derived the asymptotic properties of the estimators, including consistency and asymptotic normal distributions. We present several applications of our general theory, including support recovery, testing for signals and testing the existence of degree heterogeneity.

Several topics need to be addressed in future studies. First, many large-scale network data are very sparse. How to develop the proposed method to analyze large-scale sparse network needs future research. Second, we consider a nonparametric method for the conditional density function of X_{ij1} given Z_{ij} . It may suffer from the curse of dimensionality, especially when the dimension of Z_{ij} is large. Therefore, it is important to develop a dimension reduction procedure before performing the proposed method with high-dimensional data. Finally, the generalization of our methods to analyzing more complicated network data, such as dynamic networks, is also an interesting topic.

Supplemental material

The supplemental material contains the proofs of Theorems 1-6 and Propositions 1-2, and additional results in the simulation studies.

References

Andrews, D. W. (1995). Nonparametric kernel estimation for semiparametric models. *Econometric Theory*, 11, 560–586.

- Aradillas-Lopez, A. (2012). Pairwise-difference estimation of incomplete information games. Journal of Econometrics, 168, 120–140. The Econometrics of Auctions and Games.
- Cai, T., Liu, W., & Xia, Y. (2013). Two-sample covariance matrix testing and support recovery in high-dimensional and sparse settings. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108, 265–277.
- Candelaria, L. E. (2020). A semiparametric network formation model with unobserved linear heterogeneity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15603*, .
- Chen, M., Kato, K., & Leng, C. (2021). Analysis of networks via the sparse β -model. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology), 83, 887–910.
- De Paula, Á. (2020). Econometric models of network formation. Annual Review of Economics, 12, 775–799.
- Dzemski, A. (2019). An empirical model of dyadic link formation in a network with unobserved heterogeneity. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 101, 763–776.
- Fernández-Val, I., & Weidner, M. (2016). Individual and time effects in nonlinear panel models with large n, t. Journal of Econometrics, 192, 291–312.
- Gao, W. Y. (2020). Nonparametric identification in index models of link formation. Journal of Econometrics, 215, 399–413.
- Graham, B. S. (2017). An econometric model of network formation with degree heterogeneity. *Econometrica*, 85, 1033–1063.
- Graham, B. S. (2020). Dyadic regression. In *The Econometric Analysis of Network Data* (pp. 23–40). Academic Press.
- Härdle, W., Hart, J., Marron, J. S., & Tsybakov, A. B. (1992). Bandwidth choice for average derivative estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87, 218–226.
- Honoré, B. E., & Lewbel, A. (2002). Semiparametric binary choice panel data models without strictly exogeneous regressors. *Econometrica*, 70, 2053–2063.
- Hughes, D. W. (2022). Estimating nonlinear network data models with fixed effects. arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15603, .
- Kolaczyk, E. D., & Csárdi, G. (2014). Statistical Analysis of Network Data with R. Springer.
- Lazega, E. (2001). The collegial phenomenon: The social mechanisms of cooperation among peers in a corporate law partnership. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Lewbel, A. (1998). Semiparametric latent variable model estimation with endogenous or mismeasured regressors. *Econometrica*, 66, 105–121.
- Lewbel, A. (2000). Semiparametric qualitative response model estimation with unknown heteroscedasticity or instrumental variables. *Journal of Econometrics*, 97, 145–177.

- Manski, C. F. (1985). Semiparametric analysis of discrete response: Asymptotic properties of the maximum score estimator. *Journal of Econometrics*, 27, 313–333.
- Nadaraya, E. A. (1964). On estimating regression. Theory of Probability & Its Applications, 9, 141–142.
- Neyman, J., & Scott, E. L. (1948). Consistent estimates based on partially consistent observations. *Econometrica*, 16, 1–32.
- Qi, L., Wang, C. Y., & Prentice, R. L. (2005). Weighted estimators for proportional hazards regression with missing covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100, 1250– 1263.
- Stein, S., & Leng, C. (2023). An annotated graph model with differential degree heterogeneity for directed networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24, 1–69.
- Toth, P. (2017). Semiparametric estimation in network formation models with homophily and degree heterogeneity. *Working paper*, *Available at SSRN 2988698*, 1–81.
- Watson, G. S. (1964). Smooth regression analysis. Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A, (pp. 359–372).
- Yan, T., Jiang, B., Fienberg, S. E., & Leng, C. (2019). Statistical inference in a directed network model with covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114, 857–868.
- Zeleneev, A. (2020). Identification and estimation of network models with nonparametric unobserved heterogeneity. *Working paper*, *Department of Economics*, Princeton University.