

Dynamic Factor Analysis of High-dimensional Recurrent Events

Fangyi Chen^a, Yunxiao Chen^b, Zhiliang Ying^a, and Kangjie Zhou^c

^a*Department of Statistics, Columbia University*

^b*Department of Statistics, London School of Economics and Political Science*

^c*Department of Statistics, Stanford University*

Abstract

Recurrent event time data arise in many studies, including biomedicine, public health, marketing, and social media analysis. High-dimensional recurrent event data involving large numbers of event types and observations become prevalent with the advances in information technology. This paper proposes a semiparametric dynamic factor model for the dimension reduction and prediction of high-dimensional recurrent event data. The proposed model imposes a low-dimensional structure on the mean intensity functions of the event types while allowing for dependencies. A nearly rate-optimal smoothing-based estimator is proposed. An information criterion that consistently selects the number of factors is also developed. Simulation studies demonstrate the effectiveness of these inference tools. The proposed method is applied to grocery shopping data, for which an interpretable factor structure is obtained.

Keywords: Counting process; factor analysis; marginal modelling; kernel smoothing; information criterion

1 Introduction

As information technology advances, high-dimensional recurrent event data are becoming increasingly common. For example, such data are commonly seen in market basket analysis, which often tracks customers' purchasing behaviour over time to develop personalized recommendation strategies (e.g., Ferguson, 2013). Here, each customer can be viewed as an observation unit. Their shopping history can be viewed as a multivariate counting process, wherein the elements of the process correspond to a large number of merchandise items, and the event times correspond to the times when the items are purchased. Another example is text data from social media platforms (e.g., Liang et al., 2018; Bogdanowicz and Guan, 2022). In such data, a user's dynamics correspond to a multivariate counting process, where event times record the occurrence of words or phrases in posts (e.g., tweets). The user dynamics are often analyzed for user profiling, opinion mining, or understanding and predicting the information cascade on a social medium. High-dimensional recurrent event data also emerge in human-computer interactions such as simulated problem-solving tasks in educational assessment (Chen, 2020), where event times are the time-stamps of different types of actions. Data of a similar structure also appear in medicine and public health, finance, and insurance (e.g., Cook and Lawless, 2007; Sun, 2006; Yang, 2022).

We propose a dynamic factor model for analyzing high-dimensional recurrent event time data. This model introduces low-dimensional time-varying factors in a continuous time domain to capture the dynamic trends underlying a multivariate counting process while keeping the constant event-type-specific parameters, known as the loadings, to strengthen the interpretability. The model is only specified based on the mean rate functions (Lin et al., 2000), allowing for a flexible conditional dependence structure among the processes. This is crucial in applications such as consumer shopping behaviour analysis, where recurrent

events could be highly dependent due to population heterogeneity. Model identification is studied, based on which rotation methods for exploratory factor analysis (Browne, 2001; Rohe and Zeng, 2023) can be applied to the current model for obtaining an interpretable factor structure. Simultaneous estimation of factors and loadings is proposed based on a kernel-smoothed pseudo-likelihood function. We further propose an information criterion for determining the number of factors. Desirable asymptotic properties are established as the number of event types and the sample size grow to infinity. In particular, we show that the proposed information criterion consistently selects the number of factors, and the estimation is consistent and nearly rate-optimal. The proposed method is applied to a large grocery shopping dataset. This analysis finds interpretable customer factors that provide insight into customer grocery shopping behaviours.

The proposed method is related to the frailty models for recurrent event data (e.g., Abu-Libdeh et al., 1990; Chen et al., 2005). These models introduce correlated event-type-specific random effects (frailties) into the intensity functions to capture the dependence among events. With many event types, the traditional frailty model has to introduce many random effects and specify their joint distribution, making the model specification and parameter estimation challenging. The proposed model is also related to dynamic factor models for irregularly spaced longitudinal data (Chen and Zhang, 2020; Lu et al., 2015; Tang et al., 2017), where the dynamic factors are treated as stochastic processes, and Bayesian or empirical Bayesian methods are used for the statistical inferences. The proposed method may also be viewed as an extension of high-dimensional factor analysis methods (Bai and Li, 2012; Chen et al., 2020, 2021; Liu et al., 2023), which use low-dimensional latent factors to capture the dependence structure of many manifest variables. In these methods, the latent factors are treated as unknown parameters rather than random

variables during parameter estimation. This treatment avoids distributional assumptions on the latent factors and makes the estimation computationally more affordable. Based on this estimation framework, information criteria are developed for determining the number of factors (Bai and Ng, 2002; Chen and Li, 2022). The current work is similar in spirit but involves estimating low-dimensional functions of dynamic factors, for which the estimation and model selection are more challenging.

For a matrix $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ij})_{N \times J}$, let $\|\mathbf{X}\|_F$ and $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$ denote its Frobenius norm and two-to-infinity norm, respectively. For two real numbers a and b , we write $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$. For two sequences of real numbers $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we write $a_n \ll b_n$ or, equivalently, $a_n = o(b_n)$, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 0$, $a_n = O(b_n)$ if there is a positive constant M independent with n , such that $|a_n| \leq M|b_n|$ for all n , and $a_n \asymp b_n$ if there are two positive constants M_1 and M_2 independent with n , such that $M_1|b_n| \leq |a_n| \leq M_2|b_n|$. We use the standard $O_p(\cdot)$ notation for stochastic boundedness in probability. We use $L^2_{N \times J}[0, 1] = \{(f_{ij}(t))_{N \times J} : 0 \leq t \leq 1, \|f_{ij}\|_{L^2[0,1]} < \infty \text{ for all } i, j\}$ to denote the space of $N \times J$ -dimensional square integrable matrix-valued functions on $[0, 1]$.

2 Proposed Method

2.1 Model

Consider multivariate recurrent event data from N independent observation units on a standardized time interval $[0, 1]$. The data from observation unit i can be described by $\mathbf{Y}_i(t) = (Y_{i1}(t), \dots, Y_{iJ}(t))^\top$, where J is the number of event types, and each component $Y_{ij}(t)$ is a right-continuous counting process. We introduce a factor model to reduce the dimensionality of data and further identify and interpret the factors underlying the observed

processes.

A marginal modelling approach (Lin et al., 2000) is adopted to accommodate a more flexible conditional dependence structure among the processes. This approach specifies the mean rate function for each event type j as

$$\mathbb{E}[dY_{ij}(t)] = f(X_{ij}(t))dt, \quad (1)$$

where $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a pre-specified link function, and $X_{ij}(t)$ is an unknown function with a low-dimensional structure. Specifically, $X_{ij}(t)$ is parameterized as

$$X_{ij}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^r a_{jk} \theta_{ik}(t), \quad (2)$$

where $\theta_{ik}(\cdot)$'s are functions that may be interpreted as unobserved dynamic factors, a_{jk} 's are referred to as the loading parameters, and r is the number of factors. We denote $\Theta(t) = (\theta_{ik}(t))_{N \times r}$, $\mathbf{A} = (a_{jk})_{J \times r}$, and $\mathbf{X}(t) = (X_{ij}(t))_{N \times J}$. Rewriting Eq. (2) in matrix form, we have $\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)\mathbf{A}^\top$, where both $\Theta(\cdot)$ and \mathbf{A} are to be estimated.

Remark 1 (Link function). *The link function f is needed to ensure the mean rate function is non-negative. For simplicity, we let f be known and set $f(x) = \exp(x)$ in the numerical analysis. Extensions to the setting with unknown f can be done by estimating the link function nonparametrically via, e.g., non-negative basis function approximations.*

Remark 2 (Intensity formulation). *Alternative to the mean rate specification (1), one can model the intensity functions as $\mathbb{E}[dY_{ij}(t)|\mathcal{F}_t] = f(X_{ij}(t))dt$, for a suitable right-continuous filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ that leads to a martingale structure (Andersen et al., 1993). As pointed out by Lin et al. (2000), the mean rate specification (1) is more versatile than the intensity specification in that it allows arbitrary dependence structures among recurrent events. For*

example, when analyzing customers' purchasing behaviour, multiple merchandise items may be purchased simultaneously and, thus, have the same event time. When analyzing users' dynamics on a social medium, multiple words or phrases often appear in the same post and, thus, have the same event time. In these examples, the independent increment assumption implied by the intensity specification fails, while the mean rate specification can still hold.

Remark 3 (Connection with factor models). *The proposed model is closely related to the Poisson factor model for count data. More specifically, consider a special case of (1) when $Y_{ij}(t)$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, are independent Poisson processes with static factors θ_{ik} , i.e., $f(X_{ij}(t)) = f(\sum_{k=1}^r a_{jk}\theta_{ik})$. In this case, the counts $\{Y_{ij}(1) : i = 1, \dots, N, j = 1, \dots, J\}$ are a sufficient statistic for the unknown parameters, with $Y_{ij}(1)$ following a Poisson distribution with rate $f(\sum_{k=1}^r a_{jk}\theta_{ik})$. This model for count data is known as the Poisson factor model (Chen et al., 2020; Wedel and Kamakura, 2001), where a_{jk} 's are known as the loading parameters, and θ_{ik} 's are interpreted as the unobserved factors. In this sense, the proposed model (1)-(2) can be viewed as an extension of the Poisson factor model. The Poisson factor model can be estimated by a constrained joint maximum likelihood estimator (Chen et al., 2020), which is consistent and minimax rate optimal under suitable regularity conditions.*

Remark 4 (Indeterminacy of $\Theta(\cdot)$ and \mathbf{A} and a rotated solution). *Note that $\Theta(\cdot)$ and \mathbf{A} are not determined, in the sense that for any $r \times r$ invertible matrix \mathbf{Q} , the model remains unchanged if we replace the factors by $\Theta(t)(\mathbf{Q}^\top)^{-1}$ and replace the loadings by $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{Q}$. Similar indeterminacies also occur in other factor models (see, e.g., Bai and Li, 2012). To identify and interpret the factor structure, one must fix the transformation \mathbf{Q} , which may be done using an analytic rotation method (Browne, 2001; Rohe and Zeng, 2023). However, it is worth noting that the current setting is slightly different from standard exploratory factor*

analysis settings, as factors here are functions of time t . To apply existing analytic rotation methods, we may first aggregate the factors by calculating $\bar{\Theta} = \int_0^1 \Theta(t)dt$, and then apply an analytic rotation method to $\bar{\Theta}\mathbf{A}^\top$. In real data analysis in Section 5, a varimax rotation method (Kaiser, 1958; Rohe and Zeng, 2023) is applied to fix the transformation.

Remark 5 (Time-varying loadings). We note that the flexibility of the model can be further enhanced by letting the loading parameters be time-varying, i.e., $X_{ij}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^r a_{jk}(t)\theta_{ik}(t)$. However, this model is far less determined than the current model in the sense that

$$\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)(\mathbf{A}(t))^\top = \Theta(t)(\mathbf{Q}(t)^\top)^{-1}(\mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{Q}(t))^\top$$

for any $r \times r$ invertible matrix-valued function $\mathbf{Q}(t)$. Determining this transformation function $\mathbf{Q}(t)$ is more challenging than determining the time-independent transformation discussed in Remark 4. Consequently, it is hard to identify and interpret the factor structure. In addition, in our grocery shopping application, each event type corresponds to a merchandise item, and each observation corresponds to a customer. In this context, the loading parameters can be viewed as a summary of item characteristics, and the factors can be interpreted as a summary of customer preferences. Because item characteristics tend to be stable while customer preferences often vary over time, treating the loading parameters as static and the factors as dynamic is intuitive. For these reasons, the current paper focuses on the static loading and dynamic factor setting.

2.2 Estimation

We introduce a kernel-based approach for estimating the unknown parameters. Let $K(x)$ be a kernel function with sufficient smoothness, satisfying $K(x) \geq 0$, $K(-x) = K(x)$ and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K(x)dx = 1$. For a smoothing bandwidth $h > 0$, we further define $K_h(x) =$

$(1/h)K(x/h)$. We consider the following pseudo-likelihood function:

$$\mathcal{L}_h(\Theta, \mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \log f(X_{ij}(t)) - f(X_{ij}(t)) \right) dt, \quad (3)$$

where $X_{ij}(t)$ is a function of Θ and \mathbf{A} as defined in (2). We consider the parameter space

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ (\Theta, \mathbf{A}) : \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|\Theta(t)\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M, \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M \right\},$$

where $M > 0$ is a prespecified constant. We define $(\widehat{\Theta}, \widehat{\mathbf{A}})$ as a constrained maximizer of (3),

$$(\widehat{\Theta}, \widehat{\mathbf{A}}) \in \arg \max_{(\Theta, \mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{G}} \mathcal{L}_h(\Theta, \mathbf{A}). \quad (4)$$

Since the parameter space \mathcal{G} is compact and $\mathcal{L}_h(\Theta, \mathbf{A})$ is continuous with respect to the norm $\|(\widehat{\Theta}, \widehat{\mathbf{A}})\| = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|\Theta(t)\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \vee \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty}$, the existence of at least one solution is guaranteed. Therefore, $(\widehat{\Theta}, \widehat{\mathbf{A}})$ is well-defined.

Remark 6. *If (1) is replaced by an intensity function specification, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[dY_{ij}(t)|\mathcal{F}_t] = f(X_{ij}(t))dt$, and let h go to 0, then (3) becomes the log-likelihood function for recurrent event time data (Cook and Lawless, 2007).*

Remark 7. *In practice, we can only obtain an approximate solution to (4), as the optimization involves infinite-dimensional functions. When the resolution of the approximation is carefully chosen, this approximate solution can achieve the same error rate as that of (4). More specifically, the approximate solution is obtained by a two-step procedure. In the first step, we discretize the interval $[h, 1-h]$ by equally spaced grid points t_1, \dots, t_q and*

solve

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{\Theta}(t_1), \dots, \tilde{\Theta}(t_q), \tilde{\mathbf{A}}) &\in \arg \max \mathcal{L}_h(\Theta(t_1), \dots, \Theta(t_q), \mathbf{A}) \\
s.t. \quad \|\Theta(t_l)\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} &\leq M, \quad \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M, \quad l = 1, \dots, q,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_h(\Theta(t_1), \dots, \Theta(t_q), \mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^q \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t_l - s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t_l - s) ds} \log f(X_{ij}(t_l)) - f(X_{ij}(t_l)) \right) \tag{6}$$

is the pseudo-likelihood defined on the grid points. In the second step, based on $\tilde{\Theta}$ we find an approximation to $\hat{\Theta}$ on $[h, 1 - h]$ by interpolation, such as a linear interpolation. By choosing the number of grid points to be inversely proportional to the error rate of (4), the approximate solution is guaranteed to achieve the same error rate. A projected gradient descent algorithm is proposed to obtain the approximate solution; the details of the algorithm and the properties of its convergence can be found in the supplementary material.

2.3 Determining the Number of Factors

In practice, the number of factors r is unknown and, thus, needs to be chosen. We propose an information criterion to choose r . To avoid ambiguity, we use $(\hat{\Theta}^{(r)}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}^{(r)})$ to denote the estimator (3) to emphasize its dependence on the number of factors. The proposed information criterion takes the form

$$\text{IC}(r) = -2\mathcal{L}_h(\hat{\Theta}^{(r)}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}^{(r)}) + v(N, J, r),$$

where $v(N, J, r)$ is a penalty term that increases with N , J and r . The conditions on $v(N, J, r)$ for consistent model selection will be determined in Section 3.2. Given $v(N, J, r)$,

we choose the number of factors by

$$\hat{r} = \operatorname{argmin}_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \text{IC}(r), \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a candidate set for the number of factors. As shown in Section 3, under suitable conditions on the penalty term and additional regularity conditions, \hat{r} consistently selects the number of factors.

3 Theoretical properties

3.1 Consistency and Rate of Convergence

We present our main theoretical results about the estimator proposed in Section 2.2. When deriving these results, the number of factors is assumed to be correctly specified. To avoid ambiguity of notation, we let $\Theta^*(\cdot)$ and \mathbf{A}^* denote the true parameters, and further let $\mathbf{X}^*(t) = \Theta^*(t)(\mathbf{A}^*)^\top$. To avoid the complications brought by the indeterminacy of $\Theta(\cdot)$ and \mathbf{A} , we focus on evaluating the estimation accuracy of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}(t) := \hat{\Theta}(t)\hat{\mathbf{A}}^\top$. Let $m \geq 1$ be a positive integer. We assume the following regularity conditions.

Condition 1. *The link function f is m times continuously differentiable. Moreover, for $x \in [-M, M]$, $f(x)$ and $f'(x)$ are bounded away from 0.*

Condition 2. *The matrix function $\mathbf{X}^*(\cdot) \in \mathcal{G}$ is m times continuously differentiable on $[0, 1]$.*

Condition 3. *The kernel function K satisfies: (i) it is a Lipschitz function of order m with compact support on $[-1, 1]$; (ii) it attains its unique maximum at $x = 0$; (iii) it is twice continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of 0 and $(\log K)''(0) < 0$.*

Condition 4. (i) *There exists $\lambda > 0$, such that for any i, j, k , and $0 < s_1 < \dots < s_k < 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E} [dY_{ij}(s_1) \cdots dY_{ij}(s_k)] \leq \lambda^k ds_1 \cdots ds_k.$$

(ii) *For any i , there exists a partition $B_{i,1}, \dots, B_{i,W_i}$ of $\{1, \dots, J\}$ and a function $\phi(J) = o(J)$ satisfying $\max_{i=1, \dots, N} \max_{k=1, \dots, W_i} |B_{i,k}| \leq \phi(J)$, such that*

$$\{Y_{ij}(\cdot) : j \in B_{i,1}\}, \dots, \{Y_{ij}(\cdot) : j \in B_{i,W_i}\}$$

are independent.

Remark 8. *Note that in Condition 1, we assume that both $f(x)$ and $f'(x)$ are non-zero in $[-M, M]$. This requirement is rather mild. In particular, this requirement is automatically satisfied when $f(x)$ is strictly positive and monotone increasing (or decreasing), including when $f(x) = \exp(x)$.*

Remark 9. *Condition 2 is a standard assumption in nonparametric regression models (Györfi et al., 2002).*

Remark 10. *Conditions 3(i) and 3(ii) are standard assumptions for kernel functions. Condition 3(iii) assumes log-concavity at the maximum point.*

Remark 11. *Condition 4(i) assumes non-degeneracy of the counting process. Condition 4(ii) assumes a blockwise independent structure, which substantially relaxes the independence assumption among different event types. Note that we restrict the maximum block size rather than assuming the blockwise independent structure to be the same across observations $i = 1, \dots, N$. Condition 4(ii) can be further relaxed. Instead of requiring the processes in all the blocks to be independent, our theoretical results in Theorems 1 and 3*

are still valid if only

$$\{Y_{ij}(\cdot) : j \in B_{i,1}\}, \dots, \{Y_{ij}(\cdot) : j \in B_{i,W_i-1}\}$$

are independent. This relaxed condition allows the processes in B_{i,W_i} to be dependent on all the rest of the processes.

Next, we establish error bounds for the proposed estimator. The upper bound is provided in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (upper bound). *Under Conditions 1-4:*

- (i) (Dependent case) Assume $J = O(N)$ and recall $\phi(J)$ from Condition 4(ii). For any $\delta > 0$, choose $h \asymp (J/\phi(J))^{-1/(2m+1)+\delta/m}$. Then, we have

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 dt = O_p \left((J/\phi(J))^{-m/(2m+1)+\delta} \right).$$

- (ii) (Independent case) Assume that $\phi(J) = 1$ in Condition 4(ii) and $\log(N \vee J) \ll N \wedge J$.

For any $\delta > 0$, choose $h \asymp ((N \wedge J)/(\log^2(N \wedge J)))^{-1/(2m+1)}$. Then, we have

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 dt = O_p \left((N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} \right).$$

To show the near optimality of the proposed estimator, we then derive the minimax lower bound under the independent Poisson process setting in the following theorem.

Theorem 2 (lower bound). *Assume that the Y_{ij} 's are independent Poisson point processes and $\phi(J) = 1$ in Condition 4(ii). Further assume that $\sup_{|x| \leq M} f'(x)^2/f(x) < \infty$, then there is an absolute constant $C > 0$, so that for any estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) \in L_{N \times J}^2[0, 1]$, there*

exists an $\mathbf{X}^*(t)$ satisfying Condition 2 such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 dt \geq C (N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence, this information-theoretic lower bound matches the upper bound in Theorem 1 only up to an arbitrarily small exponent under the independence assumption, which implies the near minimax optimality of our estimator.

Remark 12. *When the blockwise independent structure is assumed to be the same across observations (i.e., $W_i = W$, and $B_{i,w} = B_w$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, $w = 1, \dots, W$), we can sharpen the rate in Theorem 1(i) from $-m/(2m+1) + \delta$ to $-2m/(2m+1) + \delta$ and similarly establish its near minimax optimality.*

3.2 Model Selection Consistency

Recall that $v(N, J, r)$ is the penalty function in the information criterion. Since $v(N, J, r)$ is increasing in r , we denote $u(N, J, r) = v(N, J, r) - v(N, J, r - 1) > 0$. Further, for any $t \in [0, 1]$, we let $\sigma_{1,t} \geq \sigma_{2,t} \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{r^*,t}$ be the non-zero singular values of $\mathbf{X}^*(t)$. The following theorem provides sufficient conditions on $u(N, J, r)$ for consistent model selection.

Theorem 3 (model selection consistency). *Assume that the candidate set \mathcal{R} has a finite number of elements and $r^* \in \mathcal{R}$. Under Conditions 1-4:*

(i) *(Dependent case) Assume $J = O(N)$ and function u satisfies*

$$u(N, J, r) = o \left(\int_h^{1-h} \sigma_{r^*,t}^2 dt \right), \quad NJ (J/\phi(J))^{-m/(2m+1)+\delta} = o(u(N, J, r))$$

for some $\delta > 0$ small enough and any $r \in \mathcal{R}$ as N and J go to infinity. Choose

$h \asymp (J/\phi(J))^{-1/(2m+1)+\delta/m}$. Then we have

$$\lim_{N, J \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{r} = r^*) = 1.$$

(ii) (Independent case) Assume that $\phi(J) = 1$ in Condition 4(ii), $\log(N \vee J) \ll N \wedge J$ and the function u satisfies

$$u(N, J, r) = o\left(\int_h^{1-h} \sigma_{r^*, t}^2 dt\right), \quad NJ (\min(N, J))^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} = o(u(N, J, r))$$

for some $\delta > 0$ small enough and any $r \in \mathcal{R}$ as N and J go to infinity. Choose $h \asymp ((N \wedge J)/(\log^2(N \wedge J)))^{-1/(2m+1)}$. Then we have

$$\lim_{N, J \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{r} = r^*) = 1.$$

Remark 13. The two conditions on $u(N, J, r)$ in either (i) or (ii) of Theorem 3 constrain the upper and lower bounds of the penalty functions. The first condition $u(N, J, r) = o\left(\int_h^{1-h} \sigma_{r^*, t}^2 dt\right)$ requires that $u(N, J, r)$ is smaller than the integral of the gap between non-zero singular values and zero singular values of $\mathbf{X}^*(\cdot)$. Under this requirement, the probability of under-selecting the number of factors is small. The second condition requires that $u(N, J, r)$ grows faster than the upper bound of estimation error. This requirement guarantees that with high probability, we do not over-select the number of factors.

Remark 14. The results in Theorems 1 and 3 can be extended if we want to use a kernel function supported on the whole real line, for example, the Gaussian kernel function $K(x) \propto \exp(-x^2/2)$. In such cases, Condition 3 needs to be modified. The details are given in the supplementary material.

Remark 15. *The results in Theorems 1 and 3 can also be extended to a missing data setting under an ignorable missingness assumption. Let ω_{ij} be a binary random variable, indicating the missingness of $\{Y_{ij}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$, where $\omega_{ij} = 1$ means that $\{Y_{ij}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ is observed and $\omega_{ij} = 0$ if $\{Y_{ij}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ is missing. We can still establish corresponding results in Theorems 1 and 3 under suitable conditions based on the following pseudo-likelihood function for partially observed data:*

$$\sum_{(i,j):\omega_{ij}=1} \int_h^{1-h} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \log f(X_{ij}(t)) - f(X_{ij}(t)) \right) dt.$$

4 Simulation Study

We evaluate the proposed estimator and information criterion with a simulation study. In this study, we generate data from the proposed model, where the number of factors is set to $r^* = 3$, and the numbers of observation units and event types satisfy $N = 2J$. We consider three patterns regarding the dynamic component $\Theta^*(t)$, denoted by C1, C2, and C3, in which $\Theta^*(t)$ is constant, changes linearly, and changes periodically, respectively, on the interval $[0, 1]$. We further consider two different settings for generating \mathbf{A}^* , denoted by S1 and S2, resulting in two different signal-to-noise levels, where Setting S1 has a stronger signal than Setting S2. We vary the number of event types J , by setting $J = 200, 400, 600$, and 800 . Finally, we consider data generation under the dependent and independent settings in Theorem 1. The factors discussed above lead to a total of 24 simulation settings. For each setting, 50 independent replications are generated. The proposed method is compared with the Poisson factor model discussed in Remark 3 that ignores the dynamic nature of the process and only concerns the total event counts on the entire time interval. Following a similar proof as that for Theorem 1, the likelihood-based

estimator under the Poisson factor model is consistent even under the dependent-event-type settings when $\Theta^*(t)$ is constant. As the Poisson factor model involves less parameters, it is expected to be statistically more efficient than the proposed estimator under the settings when $\Theta^*(t)$ is constant. In the other settings, the Poisson factor model has biases because it ignores the dynamic nature of the event data.

In what follows, we elaborate on the data generation and results under settings where the event types are dependent. Further details about the simulation settings and the results under the independent-event-type settings are given in the supplementary material. We note that the results under the independent-event-type settings have similar patterns but the estimates are more accurate than those under the corresponding dependent settings.

Under the dependent setting, we set $\phi(J) = J^{1/3}$ and generate data $\{Y_{ij}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ with the following steps: First, we divide event types $j = 1, \dots, J$ into $\lfloor J/\phi(J) \rfloor$ blocks $B_1, \dots, B_{\lfloor J/\phi(J) \rfloor}$ that are of approximately the same size, where $\lfloor J/\phi(J) \rfloor$ denotes the greatest integer less than or equal to $J/\phi(J)$. Second, for the k -th block, we generate a Poisson process with intensity function $f_k(t) := \max_{j \in B_k} f(X_{ij}^*(t)) = f(\max_{j \in B_k} X_{ij}^*(t))$, and denote the generated event times as $0 < t_{k,1} < \dots < t_{k,p_k} < 1$. Finally, using a standard thinning algorithm for simulating point processes (Chen, 2016), for each $i = 1, \dots, N$ and each $j \in B_k$, we accept $t_{k,1}, \dots, t_{k,p_k}$ with probabilities $f(X_{ij}^*(t_{k,1}))/f_k(t_{k,1}), \dots, f(X_{ij}^*(t_{k,p_k}))/f_k(t_{k,p_k})$ independently and let the accepted time points to be the event times of $Y_{ij}(t)$. The resulting point processes are guaranteed to follow the proposed model.

We choose the Epanechnikov kernel function $K(x) = 0.75(1 - x^2)$, $-1 \leq x \leq 1$, with kernel order $m = 2$. It is easy to verify that the chosen kernel function satisfies Condition 3. The link function is $f(x) = \exp(x)$. We set $h = 0.1(J/\phi(J))^{-0.19}$ and $M = 6$. We estimate $\mathbf{X}(t)$ based on 31 evenly distributed time points t_1, \dots, t_{31} on $[h, 1-h]$.

Kernel-based method	S1			S2		
	C1	C2	C3	C1	C2	C3
$J = 200$	0.0589	0.0678	0.0731	0.0765	0.0868	0.0936
$J = 400$	0.0325	0.0377	0.0409	0.0429	0.0474	0.0517
$J = 600$	0.0233	0.0272	0.0291	0.0305	0.0340	0.0367
$J = 800$	0.0184	0.0213	0.0230	0.0238	0.0269	0.0288
Poisson factor model	C1	C2	C3	C1	C2	C3
$J = 200$	0.0073	1.2712	0.6295	0.0093	0.9082	0.4634
$J = 400$	0.0036	1.2888	0.6312	0.0046	0.9076	0.4648
$J = 600$	0.0024	1.3082	0.6298	0.0031	0.9087	0.4625
$J = 800$	0.0018	1.2953	0.6378	0.0023	0.9025	0.4665

Table 1: Mean prediction error among 50 independent replications based on the proposed estimator and the estimator under the Poisson factor model under 24 simulation settings.

For the proposed model, the estimation error is evaluated by $(1 - 2h) \sum_{k=1}^{31} \|\mathbf{X}^*(t_k) - \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t_k)\|_F^2 / (31NJ)$, which approximates the error $\int_h^{1-h} \|\mathbf{X}^*(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t)\|_F^2 dt / NJ$. Under the Poisson factor model, we obtain $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}}$, where $\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}}$ is constant over time. We compute $(1 - 2h) \sum_{k=1}^{31} \|\mathbf{X}^*(t_k) - \widehat{\mathbf{X}}\|_F^2 / (31NJ)$ as its estimation error, and compare it with the error of the proposed estimator.

The results regarding the estimation errors are given in Table 1. They show that, for each combination of S_i and C_j , $i = 1, 2$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, the estimation error of the proposed method decays as N and J grow. Under settings in which $\mathbf{\Theta}^*(t)$ is constant (i.e., C1), the estimator given by the Poisson factor model has smaller errors than the proposed estimator. In the rest of the settings, the proposed estimator yields substantially smaller estimation errors than those under the Poisson factor model.

Finally, we evaluate the accuracy regarding selecting the number of factors. In the information criterion, we set the penalty term to be $v(N, J, r) = 30rNh^{1.99}$ and select r from the candidate set $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. According to our simulation results, the number of factors is always correctly selected under all the simulation settings, indicating a superior performance of the proposed information criterion.

5 Application to Grocery Shopping Data

5.1 Background, Data Processing, and Analysis

We apply the proposed method to a grocery shopping dataset¹, containing transaction records collected by a retailer in two years about its frequent shoppers. We discard the first 15% of the observation period since the number of total transactions is significantly lower than the rest, likely due to late entries. The remaining period is then standardized to the interval $[0,1]$. After pre-processing, we obtain a dataset with $N = 1,978$ shoppers and $J = 2,000$ products. The dataset contains information on each product regarding its type (e.g., cheese, chips). It also contains the demographic information of 796 shoppers, including age, income, and child (having children or not). Such information is not used in the proposed model but is used for validating and interpreting our results. Here, the matrix-valued function Θ may be interpreted as the dynamic customer factors, and the matrix \mathbf{A} may be interpreted as the attributes of the products. We apply the proposed information criterion with the candidate set $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, which selects $r = 3$ factors. Following the discussion in Remark 4, we apply a varimax rotation for the selected three-factor model to obtain an interpretable factor structure.

5.2 Interpreting Factors

We interpret the factors based on the estimated loading matrix after rotation. Specifically, let $\tilde{A} = (\tilde{a}_{ij})_{J \times r}$ be the loading matrix after rotation. We say a product j dominantly loads on factor k if $\tilde{a}_{jk}^2 / (\sum_{l=1}^r \tilde{a}_{jl}^2)$ is large, i.e., \tilde{a}_{jk} is dominantly larger than the rest of the loadings in magnitude. We investigate the top 60 products that dominantly load on each factor. Table 2 lists the types of these products. We note that many products with

¹The dataset is available from <https://www.dunnhumby.com/source-files>.

Factor 1	yogurt(10), salad(3), herbs(parsley, cilantro)(3), organic fruit/vegetable(3), blueberry(3), mushroom(2), tropical fruit(mango, pineapple)(2), beans(2), pepper(2), cheese(2)
Factor 2	soft drink(11), cold cereal(5), hot sauce(5), refrigerated drink(4), chicken wings(4), frozen meat(3), dinner sausage(3), candy(3), frozen pizza(2), cigarette(2), potato chips(2), canned pasta(2)
Factor 3	cheese(7), milk(5), white bread(4), fruit(banana, grape, strawberry)(4), egg(4), vegetable(cucumber, celery, cabbage, corn)(4), onion(4), salad(3), soft drink(2), hamburger bun(2), beef(2), tomato(2), potato(2)

Table 2: Products with large positive factor loadings for each of the three factors.

dominant loadings on the same factor tend to be of a small number of types. These types are presented only once in the table, followed by the corresponding number of products of this type in parentheses. Product types that only appear once for each factor are omitted for brevity.

Table 2 shows that the items with dominant loadings on the first factor are mostly fresh and healthy food products suitable for vegetarian dietary preferences. Items with dominant loadings on the second factor contain unhealthy (e.g., soft drinks, candy, potato chips), fast food (e.g., cold cereal, frozen pizza), or budget-friendly products (e.g., frozen meat). Finally, items that load dominantly on the third factor are mostly basic food products of daily need, including bread, eggs, milk, and beef. While these products include many fresh and healthy food products similar to those loading on the first factor, they tend to be more budget-friendly. Given these features, we may interpret the three factors as “healthy food consumption”, “unhealthy food consumption”, and “basic food consumption” factors, respectively.

We further investigate the three factors by regressing them on the three demographic variables: age, income, and child. Here, age is an ordinal variable referring to the estimated age range of the shopper. For simplicity, we transform it into a binary variable, which takes value 1 if the age is above 55 and 0 otherwise. The variable income is an ordinal variable

recording the household income level. We simplify it to be a variable with three categories, – under \$35,000 ($\text{income1} = 0, \text{income2} = 0$), \$35,000 - \$75,000 ($\text{income1} = 1, \text{income2} = 0$), and above \$75,000 ($\text{income1} = 0, \text{income2} = 1$). Finally, the variable `child` is a binary variable indicating whether the shopper’s household has children. We run a linear regression model for each factor by regressing the factor scores on `age`, `income1`, `income2`, `child`, and the interactions between `child` and `income1` and `income2`. The interaction terms are added because it is suspected that the child effect differs between high- and low-income households.

The results from these regression models are given in Table 3, where only the statistically significant coefficients and their p-values are presented. As the coefficients for the interaction between the dummy variable `income1` and `child` are insignificant in all three models, the corresponding row is not presented. All the terms are statistically significant for the first factor, except for `age` and the interaction between `income1` and `child`. In particular, the coefficients associated with the summary variables for income are all positive, meaning that the consumption of healthy food increases with the household income, controlling for the rest of the variables. In addition, the coefficient for `child` is negative, and the coefficient for the interaction between `income2` and `child` is positive and larger in absolute value than that of the coefficient for `child`. It means households with relatively lower income (less than \$75,000) tend to shop less healthy food when they have children, while those with higher income (above \$75,000) tend to shop more healthy food when they have children.

All the coefficients are significant for the second factor, except for those associated with the two interaction terms. The coefficient for `age` is negative, suggesting that the older group tends to consume less unhealthy food than the younger ones, controlling for the rest

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
age		-0.007 ($p = 0.00$)	0.006 ($p = 0.00$)
income1	0.006 ($p = 0.00$)	-0.005 ($p = 0.02$)	
income2	0.015 ($p = 0.00$)	-0.021 ($p = 0.00$)	
child	-0.007 ($p = 0.01$)	0.010 ($p = 0.00$)	
income2× child	0.009 ($p = 0.01$)		

Table 3: The coefficients when regressing the factors on demographic variables.

of the variables. The coefficients for income are also negative, suggesting that households with a higher income tend to consume less unhealthy food when controlling for the rest of the variables. On the other hand, the coefficient for child is positive, meaning that households with children tend to consume more unhealthy food. This may be because this food category contains most soft drinks and snacks like candy and potato chips that children often favour.

Regarding the third factor, it is found that only the coefficient for age is statistically significant. The positive coefficient means that older people consume more basic food products. Combining the results for the second factor, we believe this may be because older people tend to have a healthier lifestyle. Although they do not consume more healthy food associated with the first factor, they cook more frequently using basic food products and eat less unhealthy food than the younger ones.

5.3 Investigating Purchase Dynamics

We further investigate the dynamic trend the model captures. In particular, for each pair of consumer i and product j , we measure the variability in the personal purchasing rate by the total variation of $X_{ij}(\cdot)$, i.e., $\int_0^1 |X'_{ij}(t)|dt$, where $X'_{ij}(t)$ denotes the derivative of $X_{ij}(t)$. A larger total variation implies a higher variability. Under the estimated three-factor model, we estimate this variability based on the finite differences between $\widehat{X}_{ij}(t)$ for

may be due to seasonal shifts in consumer demand. The demand for these products tends to increase during the warmer months, while it decreases during the colder months when warming foods and drinks are preferred.

Dairy products, eggs, beef, and candy displayed at the checkout lane are product types with consistently low variability. These are staples in many people's daily diets. Their supply and demand are typically stable throughout the year. The sales of candies displayed in the checkout lane are expected to be stable due to their constant high visibility, accessibility, and affordability, which can hardly be affected by economic conditions or other seasonal factors.

6 Discussions

This paper proposes a dynamic factor model for high-dimensional recurrent event data and develops estimation and model selection methods based on a marginal modelling approach. The estimation and model selection are guaranteed to be consistent as both the sample size and the number of event types grow to infinity, even when the event types are dependent. The proposed model was applied to grocery shopping data, which yielded insights into customer behaviours. This analysis identified three consumer dynamic factors, which may be interpreted as the healthy, unhealthy, and basic food consumption factors, respectively. Interesting results about customer behaviours were found with linear regression analyses that regress the factor scores onto customers' demographic variables. The analysis found that households with a relatively high income consume more healthy food when they have children, while those with a lower income consume less healthy food when they have children. It also found that households, regardless of income level, tend to consume more unhealthy food when having children. Moreover, the dynamic feature of the proposed model allowed

us to explore the dynamic pattern of customers' purchase behaviours, which simple summary statistics of the data can hardly reveal due to the high noise level in the data. It identified product types with high sales fluctuation, such as vegetables and tropical fruits, and those with low sales fluctuation, such as dairy products and eggs.

The theoretical results of the proposed estimator under the dependent event setting may be improved. There is a gap between the error rates under the dependent and independent settings in Theorem 1, and in particular, the convergence rate is slower when $\phi(J) = 1$ in the upper bound for the dependent setting than that for the independent setting. This may be an artefact of our proof strategy, as certain random matrix results that are key to establishing the upper bound for the independent setting do not apply to the dependent setting. As discussed in Remark 12, the gap can be filled when the blockwise independent structure does not vary across individuals. Under the more general individual-specific blockwise structure in Condition 4, this gap may still be filled with a more refined analysis. We leave it for future investigation.

A useful application of the proposed method is for detecting changes in each observation unit, which may be of interest in many applications. For example, in the grocery shopping application, a change in the dynamic factor of a household may imply a structural change in their consumer behaviour, based on which individualized marketing strategy may be developed. Although we currently require each $\theta_{ik}(t)$ to be sufficiently smooth, this requirement can be relaxed to allow each $\theta_{ik}(t)$ to be a piecewise smooth function. Using the proposed method, changes can be detected based on the estimated functions, which is closely related to change-point detection in the nonparametric regression literature (e.g., Xia and Qiu, 2015). Methods and theories remain to be developed for optimally localizing the changes based on the estimated functions.

Appendix

The results in Theorems 1 and 3 can be extended if we want to use a kernel function supported on the whole real line, for example, the Gaussian kernel function $K(x) \propto \exp(-x^2/2)$; see Appendix A for details. In such cases, Condition 3 can be modified as Condition 3' as follows.

Condition 3'. *The kernel function K satisfies: (i) it is a Lipschitz function of order m ; (ii) it attains its unique maximum at $x = 0$; (iii) it is twice continuously differentiable in a neighbourhood of 0 and $(\log K)''(0) < 0$; (iv) there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for $k = 1, \dots, m - 1$, the tail bound satisfies*

$$\max \left\{ \left| \int_{x \geq R} x^k |K(x)| dx \right|, \left| \int_{x \leq -R} x^k |K(x)| dx \right| \right\} = o(R^{-(m-k)/\epsilon})$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

Under the above condition, all the limits of integration in Theorems 1 and 3 should be changed from $[h, 1 - h]$ to $[h^{1-\epsilon}, 1 - h^{1-\epsilon}]$.

A Proof of Theorems and Lemmas

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the following two lemmas, whose proof will be provided later in Appendix B.

Lemma 1. *For $a, b \in [-\alpha, \alpha]$ and $f(x)$ satisfying Condition 1, we have*

$$(a - b)^2 \leq 4\beta_\alpha \left(f(a) \log \frac{f(a)}{f(b)} - (f(a) - f(b)) \right).$$

Lemma 2. Assume Condition 2 and 3, then there exists a positive constant C_m that only depends on m , such that for any $t \in (0, 1)$, as long as $h \leq \min \{t, 1 - t\}$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)f(X_{ij}(s))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} - f(X_{ij}(t)) \right| \leq C_m h^m.$$

Remark 16. If we modify Condition 3 by Condition 3', then Lemma 2 still hold for any $t \in [h^{1-\epsilon}, 1 - h^{1-\epsilon}]$.

Proof of Theorem 1. For notational simplicity, we treat $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(\cdot) = \widehat{\Theta}(\cdot)\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^T$ as the obtained estimator, and assume that (recasting M as $M^{1/2}$)

$$\left\| \widehat{\Theta}(t) \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M^{1/2}, \quad \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{A}} \right\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M^{1/2} \implies \left| \widehat{X}_{ij}(t) \right| \leq M, \quad \forall i, j, t.$$

We first prove the upper bound for the dependent case of Theorem 1. For $t \in (0, 1)$, denote

$$\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log f(X_{ij}(t)) - f(X_{ij}(t)) \right).$$

By Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 dt \\ &= \frac{1}{NJ} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} (\widehat{X}_{ij}(t) - X_{ij}^*(t))^2 dt \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{4\beta_M}{NJ} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \log \frac{f(X_{ij}^*(t))}{f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t))} - (f(X_{ij}^*(t)) - f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t))) \right) dt \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{4\beta_M}{NJ} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)f(X_{ij}^*(s))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log \frac{f(X_{ij}^*(t))}{f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t))} - (f(X_{ij}^*(t)) - f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t))) \right) dt \\ &\quad + \frac{4\beta_M}{NJ} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)f(X_{ij}^*(s))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} - f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \right| \left| \log \frac{f(X_{ij}^*(t))}{f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t))} \right| dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \frac{4\beta_M}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} (\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t))) dt + \frac{4\beta_M}{NJ} NJ \cdot C_m h^m \cdot 2 \sup_{|x| \leq M} |\log f(x)| \\
&= \frac{4\beta_M}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} (\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t))) dt + 8\beta_M C_m h^m \sup_{|x| \leq M} |\log f(x)|,
\end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from Lemma 1, (ii) follows from triangle inequality, and (iii) follows from the definition of $\mathcal{L}_{t,h}$ and Lemma 2. Note that here the expectation is taken only over the randomness of $\{Y_{ij}(t)\}_{i \in [N], j \in [J]}$. By the definition of $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(\cdot)$, we have

$$\int_h^{1-h} \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t)) dt = \mathcal{L}_h(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}) \geq \mathcal{L}_h(\mathbf{X}^*) = \int_h^{1-h} \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) dt.$$

Now we denote

$$G = \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times J} : \mathbf{X} = \Theta \mathbf{A}^T, \Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}, \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times r}, \|\Theta\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M^{1/2}, \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M^{1/2}\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_h^{1-h} (\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t))) dt \\
&\leq \int_h^{1-h} (\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t)) + \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t))) dt \\
&\leq 2 \int_h^{1-h} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t)\|_F^2 dt \lesssim \frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| dt + h^m. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Now we partition a Δ -net on $[0, 1]$ with $\Delta = 1/(4L_M h^{m+4})$ and $t_k = k\Delta$, $k = 1, \dots, \widetilde{K}$,

where $\tilde{K} = \lceil 1/\Delta \rceil$. Then we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| dt \geq 2h^m \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1, \dots, \tilde{K}: t_k \in [h, 1-h]} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t_k,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t_k,h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq NJh^m \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|t-t'| \leq \Delta} \left[\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| - \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t',h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t',h}(\mathbf{X})| \right] \geq NJh^m \right) \\
& \triangleq I_1 + I_2. \tag{A.9}
\end{aligned}$$

We will then bound I_1 and I_2 separately in Step 1 and Step 2.

Step 1: Bound I_1 .

Let G' be an h^{m+1} -covering of G with respect to the infinity norm, s.t. $|G'| = N(h^{m+1}, G, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$.

We know that $\forall \mathbf{X} \in G, \exists \mathbf{X}' \in G'$ such that $\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}'\|_\infty \leq h^{m+1}$. For any fixed $t \in [h, 1-h]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}') + \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}')| \\
& = \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} (\log f(X_{ij}) - \log f(X'_{ij})) \right| \\
& \leq L_M h^{m+1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we use a simple fact that $|\log f(a) - \log f(b)| \leq L_M |a - b|$, if $a, b \in [-M, M]$.

Therefore, if

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \leq \frac{NJ}{2L_M h}$$

and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq NJh^m,$$

then we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{X}' \in G'} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}') - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}')| \geq \frac{NJh^m}{2}.$$

Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq NJh^m \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \geq \frac{NJ}{2L_M h} \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{X}' \in G'} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}') - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}')| \geq \frac{NJh^m}{2} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \geq \frac{NJ}{2L_M h} \right) \\ & \quad + N(h^{m+1}, G, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \sup_{\mathbf{X}' \in G'} \mathbb{P} \left(|\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}') - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}')| \geq \frac{NJh^m}{2} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \geq \frac{NJ}{2L_M h} \right) \\ & \quad + N(h^{m+1}, G, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} \mathbb{P} \left(|\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq \frac{NJh^m}{2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

We then bound the two terms in Eq. (A.10) in Step 1.1 and Step 1.2, respectively.

Step 1.1: Bound the first term in (A.10).

For sufficiently small $x > 0$ (determined later), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \geq \frac{NJ}{2L_M h} \right) \\ & \leq \exp \left(-\frac{xNJ}{2L_M h} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \right) \right] \\ & = \exp \left(-\frac{xNJ}{2L_M h} \right) \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

For any $1 \leq i \leq N$, we have the following estimation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \right) \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^m}{m!} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \right)^m \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{J^{m-1} x^m}{m!} \sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right|^m \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^m J^{m-1} x^m}{m!} \sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right|^m \right]. \tag{A.12}
\end{aligned}$$

In the last line we use the inequality $\mathbb{E}[|X - \mathbb{E}X|^m] \leq 2^m \mathbb{E}[|X|^m]$. Since for any $t \in [h, 1-h]$, $\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds = \int_{-1}^1 K(s)ds = 1$ by Condition 3, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right|^m \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^1 |K_h(t-s)| dY_{ij}(s) \right)^m \right]. \tag{A.13}$$

Now we derive moment bounds for $\int_0^1 |K_h(t-s)| dY_{ij}(s)$. Denote (A_1, \dots, A_k) a partition of $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$ into k non-distinct subsets, where each $A_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$ is nonempty. Let $S(m, k)$ denote the number of such partitions, i.e., Stirling number of the second kind. It is known that

$$S(m, k) \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{m}{k} k^{m-k} \leq \frac{1}{2} \binom{m}{k} m^{m-k}.$$

Denote $S = \{(s_1, \dots, s_k) \in [0, 1]^k : s_i \neq s_j, \forall i, j\}$. Using Condition 4, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^1 |K_h(t-s)| dY_{ij}(s) \right)^m \right] &= \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{(A_1, \dots, A_k)} \int_S \prod_{l=1}^k |K_h(t-s_l)|^{|A_l|} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{l=1}^k dY_{ij}(s_l) \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda^k \sum_{(A_1, \dots, A_k)} \prod_{l=1}^k \int_0^1 |K_h(t-s_l)|^{|A_l|} ds_l \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda^k h^{-(m-k)} \sum_{(A_1, \dots, A_k)} \prod_{l=1}^k \int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(u)|^{|A_l|} du.
\end{aligned}$$

With the aid of Condition 3 and Laplace's method, we easily obtain that there is a constant $L' > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(u)|^{|A_l|} du \leq L' \frac{|K(0)|^{|A_l|}}{\sqrt{|A_l|}},$$

thus leading to the following estimation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^1 |K_h(t-s)| dY_{ij}(s) \right)^m \right] &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda^k h^{-(m-k)} \sum_{(A_1, \dots, A_k)} \prod_{l=1}^k \int_{\mathbb{R}} |K(u)|^{|A_l|} du \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda^k L'^k |K(0)|^m h^{-(m-k)} \sum_{(A_1, \dots, A_k)} \prod_{l=1}^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{|A_l|}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda^k L'^k |K(0)|^m h^{-(m-k)} S(m, k) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} |K(0)|^m \sum_{k=1}^m \binom{m}{k} \lambda^k L'^k \left(\frac{m}{h} \right)^{m-k} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |K(0)|^m \left[\left(\lambda L' + \frac{m}{h} \right)^m - \left(\frac{m}{h} \right)^m \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} |K(0)|^m \left(\frac{m}{h} \right)^m (\exp(\lambda L' h) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $m^m \leq m!e^m$, by (A.13) there exists an absolute constant $L > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \right|^m \right] \leq \frac{m!}{2^{m+1}} \left(\frac{L}{h} \right)^m h.$$

Hence by (A.12), for any $0 < x < h/JL$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) (dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)) ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \right| \right) \right] &\leq 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^m J^{m-1} x^m}{m!} \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{m! h}{2^{m+1}} \left(\frac{L}{h} \right)^m \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{JLx}{h} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By (A.11), this indicates that:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \geq \frac{NJ}{2L_M h} \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{xNJ}{2L_M h} \right) \frac{1}{2^N} \left(1 - \frac{JLx}{h} \right)^{-N}.$$

Hence by choosing $x = h/(2JL)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right| \geq \frac{NJ}{2L_M h} \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M} \right). \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Step 1.2: Bound the second term in (A.10).

For any $\mathbf{X} \in G$ and $x > 0$ small enough (determined later), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(|\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq \frac{NJh^m}{2} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) \geq \frac{NJh^m}{2} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(-\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) + \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) \geq \frac{NJh^m}{2} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{xNJh^m}{2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log f(X_{ij}) \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \exp \left(-\frac{xNJh^m}{2} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-x \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log f(X_{ij}) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{xNJh^m}{2} \right) \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log f(X_{ij}) \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \exp \left(-\frac{xNJh^m}{2} \right) \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-x \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log f(X_{ij}) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

By Condition 4(ii) we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s)))ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log f(X_{ij}) \right) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \prod_{k=1}^{W_i} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j \in B_{i,k}} \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log f(X_{ij}) \right) \right] \\
&\leq \prod_{k=1}^{W_i} \left[\frac{1}{|B_{i,k}|} \sum_{j \in B_{i,k}} \left[\mathbb{E} \exp \left(x |B_{i,k}| \log f(X_{ij}) \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right) \right] \right] \\
&\leq \prod_{k=1}^{W_i} \left[\frac{1}{|B_{i,k}|} \sum_{j \in B_{i,k}} \left[1 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} x^m |B_{i,k}|^m \log^m f(X_{ij}) \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right|^m \right] \right] \\
&\leq \prod_{k=1}^{W_i} \left[\frac{1}{|B_{i,k}|} \sum_{j \in B_{i,k}} \left[1 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} x^m |B_{i,k}|^m |\log^m f(X_{ij})| 2^m \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \right|^m \right] \right] \\
&\leq \prod_{k=1}^{W_i} \left[\frac{1}{|B_{i,k}|} \sum_{j \in B_{i,k}} \left[1 + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} x^m |B_{i,k}|^m |\log^m f(X_{ij})| \left(\frac{L}{h} \right)^m h \right] \right] \\
&\leq \prod_{k=1}^{W_i} \left(1 + C \frac{x^2 |B_{i,k}|^2}{h} \right) \text{ when } 0 \leq |x| |B_{i,k}|/h < 1/C \\
&\leq \exp \left(\frac{Cx^2}{h} \sum_{k=1}^{W_i} |B_{i,k}|^2 \right) \\
&\leq \exp \left(CJ\phi(J) \frac{x^2}{h} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $x > 0$ small enough, we can get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-x \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(dY_{ij}(s) - f(X_{ij}(s))ds)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \log f(X_{ij}) \right) \right] \leq \exp \left(CJ\phi(J) \frac{x^2}{h} \right).$$

Take $x = h^{m+1}/(4C\phi(J))$, then $|x| |B_{i,k}|/h \leq h^m/(4C) \ll 1$. Then by (A.15) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} \left(|\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq \frac{NJh^m}{2} \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{xNJh^m}{2} + CJ\phi(J) \frac{x^2}{h} \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{NJh^{2m+1}}{16C\phi(J)} \right). \tag{A.16}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that by the low rank assumption on G , we have

$$N(h^{m+1}, G, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq \left(\frac{C}{h^{m+1}}\right)^{r(N+J)} = \exp\left(r(N+J)\left(\log C + (m+1)\log\left(\frac{1}{h}\right)\right)\right). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Hence by (A.10), (A.14), (A.16) and (A.17), for any fixed $t \in [h, 1-h]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq NJh^m\right) \\ & \leq 2N(h^{m+1}, G, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \exp\left(-\frac{NJh^{2m+1}}{16C\phi(J)}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp\left(r(N+J)\left(\log C + (m+1)\log\left(\frac{1}{h}\right)\right) - \frac{NJh^{2m+1}}{16C\phi(J)}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\ & = 2 \exp\left(r(N+J)\left(\log C + \frac{(m+1)(1-\delta)}{2m+1}\log\left(\frac{J}{\phi(J)}\right)\right) - \frac{N}{16C}\left(\frac{J}{\phi(J)}\right)^{(2m+1)\delta/m}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\ & \lesssim \exp\left(\tilde{C}N\log\left(\frac{J}{\phi(J)}\right) - \frac{N}{16C}\left(\frac{J}{\phi(J)}\right)^{(2m+1)\delta/m}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\ & \lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \sum_{k=1, \dots, \tilde{K}: t_k \in [h, 1-h]} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{Y}(t_k), h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{Y}(t_k), h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq NJh^m\right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\delta} \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\ &\lesssim h^{-(m+4)} \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Step 2: Bound I_2 .

Since $K(x)$ is Lipschitz, we assume the corresponding Lipschitz constant is L_K . Then $K'(x)$

exists almost everywhere and $|K'(x)| \leq L_K$, then for any $t \in [h, 1-h]$ and any $\mathbf{X} \in G$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{d}{dt} [\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})] \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J L_K \sup_{|x| \leq M} |\log f(x)| \frac{\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s)}{h^2 \left| \int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds \right|} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J L_K \sup_{|x| \leq M} |\log f(x)| \frac{\int_0^1 f(X_{ij}^*(s)) ds}{h^2 \left| \int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds \right|} \\ & \lesssim \frac{1}{h^2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) + 1 \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is independent of t . This implies that $\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})|$ is a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant $C \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) + 1 \right) \right] / h^2$ on $[h, 1-h]$. We then derive the tail probability of $\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s)$. For sufficiently small $x > 0$ (determined later), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) \geq \frac{NJ}{4L_M h} \right) & \leq \exp \left(-\frac{xNJ}{4L_M h} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(t) \right) \right] \\ & = \exp \left(-\frac{xNJ}{4L_M h} \right) \prod_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(t) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For any $1 \leq i \leq N$, we have the following estimation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(t) \right) \right] & \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^m}{m!} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(t) \right)^m \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{J^{m-1} x^m}{m!} \sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(t) \right)^m \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By similar method as in Step 1.1, there exists an absolute constant $L > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(t) \right)^m \right] \leq \frac{m!}{2} [e(1+\lambda)]^m \triangleq \frac{m!}{2} L^m.$$

Hence we get that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(t) \right) \right] \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{J^{m-1} x^m}{m!} \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{m!}{2} \tilde{L}^m = \frac{1}{2} (1 - J L x)^{-1}.$$

So for any $0 < x < h/JL$, we have the following estimation:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) \geq \frac{NJ}{4L_M h} \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{xNJ}{4L_M h} \right) \frac{1}{2^N} (1 - J L x)^{-N}.$$

Choose $x = 1/(2JL)$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) \geq \frac{NJ}{4L_M h} \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{N}{8LL_M h} \right).$$

Since $\Delta = 1/(4L_M h^{m+4})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|t-t'| \leq \Delta, t, t'} \left[\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| - \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{Y}(t'),h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{Y}(t'),h}(\mathbf{X})| \right] \geq NJh^m \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{C}{h^2} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left(\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) + 1 \right) \right] \geq \frac{NJ}{4L_M h^4} \right) \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) \geq \frac{NJ}{4L_M h} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{N}{8LL_M h} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{A.19}$$

Step 3: Obtain the final bound in (A.9).

By (A.18) and (A.19) we have

$$\lim_{N, J \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E} \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| dt \geq 2h^m \right) = 0.$$

Finally by (A.8) and (A.9), we have proved that

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t)\|_F^2 = O_p(h^m) = O_p\left((J/\phi(J))^{-m/(2m+1)+\delta}\right).$$

Now we prove the second part of Theorem 1. We first give a polynomial bound by a similar method as in the proof of the first part in Step 1. Then we derive a sharper bound from the previous bound in Step 2 iteratively.

Step 1: Obtain a polynomial bound.

We still partition a Δ -net on $[0, 1]$ with $\Delta = 1/(4L_M h^{m+4})$ and $t_k = k\Delta$, $k = 1, \dots, \tilde{K}$, where $\tilde{K} = [1/\Delta]$. Then by similar method as in the proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t)\|_F^2 dt \geq 8\beta_M \left(C_m \sup_{|x| \leq M} |\log f(x)| + 2\right) h^m\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1, \dots, \tilde{K}: t_k \in [h, 1-h]} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t_k, h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t_k, h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq NJh^m\right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|t-t'| \leq \Delta, t, t'} \left[\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t, h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t, h}(\mathbf{X})| - \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t', h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t', h}(\mathbf{X})|\right] \geq NJh^m\right) \\ & \triangleq I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

By the same method as in the proof of the first part, we can get (note that $\phi(J) = 1$ under assumption):

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in G} |\mathcal{L}_{t, h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t, h}(\mathbf{X})| \geq NJh^m\right) \\ & \lesssim 2N (h^{m+1}, G, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \exp\left(-\frac{NJh^{2m+1}}{16C}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\ & \leq \exp\left(r(N+J) \left(\log C + (m+1) \log\left(\frac{1}{h}\right)\right) - \frac{NJh^{2m+1}}{16C}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \exp\left(r(N+J)\left(\log C + \frac{m+1}{2m+1}\log(N\wedge J)\right) - \frac{NJr\log^2(N\wedge J)}{16C(N\wedge J)}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\
&\lesssim \exp\left(\frac{m+1}{2m+1}r(N+J)\log(N\wedge J) - \frac{NJr\log^2(N\wedge J)}{16C(N\wedge J)}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\
&\lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{NJr\log^2(N\wedge J)}{32C(N\wedge J)}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{(N\vee J)r\log^2(N\wedge J)}{32C}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) \\
&\lesssim \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $I_1 \lesssim h^{-(m+4)} \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right)$. By the same method as in the first part, we also have $I_2 \leq \exp\left(-\frac{N}{8LL_M h}\right)$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 \geq 8\beta_M \left(C_m \sup_{|x| \leq M} |\log f(x)| + 2\right) h^m\right) \\
&\lesssim h^{-(m+4)} \exp\left(-\frac{N}{4LL_M}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{N}{8LL_M h}\right) \\
&\lesssim (N\wedge J)^{\frac{m+4}{2m+1}} \exp\left(-\frac{N\wedge J}{4LL_M}\right) \\
&\rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have proved that when $h \asymp (N\wedge J)/\log^2(N\wedge J)^{-1/(2m+1)}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 dt = O_p(h^m) = o_p((N\wedge J)^{-\frac{m}{2m+1} + \epsilon}).$$

Step 2: From a presumed upper bound to a sharper one.

Assume that for some $\alpha < 0$, we have proved that

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 dt = o_p((N\wedge J)^\alpha).$$

For future convenience we denote $Z_{ij}(t) = \log f(X_{ij}(t))$, $\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{Z}) = \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})$, and so on.

Then we also have

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t)\|_F^2 dt \leq \frac{L_M^2}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t)\|_F^2 dt = o_p((N \wedge J)^\alpha).$$

Using Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_h^{1-h} (\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{Z}^*(t))) dt \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} (\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t)) - (e^{\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t)} - e^{Z_{ij}^*(t)}) \right) dt \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} - e^{Z_{ij}^*(t)} \right) (\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t)) dt \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \frac{e^{\widetilde{Z}_{ij}(t)}}{2} (\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t))^2 dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{Z}_{ij}(t)$ is some real number between $Z_{ij}^*(t)$ and $\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t)$. Now since

$$e^{\widetilde{Z}_{ij}(t)} \geq \min(f(X_{ij}^*(t)), f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t))) \geq \inf_{|x| \leq M} f(x),$$

it follows that

$$\int_h^{1-h} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t)\|_F^2 dt \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} - f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \right) (\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t)) dt. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Denote $A_{ij} = \{\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) \leq \sqrt{h(N \wedge J)}/2K(0)\}$. By a similar proof as in the first part of Theorem 1, we can show that there exists a constant $L > 0$ such that when $0 < x < 1/L$,

we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(x \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) ds \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} (1 - Lx)^{-1}.$$

Take $x = 1/2L$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A_{ij}^c) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) \geq \frac{\sqrt{h(N \wedge J)}}{2K(0)} \right) \\ &\lesssim \exp \left(-\frac{x}{2K(0)} \sqrt{h(N \wedge J)} \right) (1 - Lx)^{-1} \\ &\lesssim \exp \left(-\tilde{C}h^{-m} \log(N \wedge J) \right). \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left((\cup_{i=1}^N \cup_{j=1}^J A_{ij})^c \right) \lesssim NJ \exp \left(-\tilde{C}h^{-m} \log(N \wedge J) \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Now we set

$$M_{ij}(t) = \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} I_{A_{ij}} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} I_{A_{ij}} \right].$$

Note that under A_{ij} , for any $t \in [h, 1-h]$ we have

$$\left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \right| \leq \frac{K(0)}{2h} \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N \wedge J}{h}}.$$

This implies that $|M_{ij}(t)|$ has a uniform bound $\sqrt{(N \wedge J)/h}$ for any $t \in [h, 1-h]$ and any i, j with probability 1. Then with probability tending to 1, by (A.20) we have

$$\int_h^{1-h} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t)\|_F^2 dt$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} M_{ij}(t) (\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t)) dt \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} I_{A_{ij}} \right] - f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \right) (\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t)) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, for $t \in (h, 1-h)$ we have the following uniform bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} I_{A_{ij}} \right] - f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \right| \\
& \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} I_{A_{ij}^c} \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \right] - f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \right| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} I_{A_{ij}^c}^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \right]^2 + C_m h^m \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}(A_{ij}^c) \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \right]^2 + C_m h^m \\
& \lesssim \exp\left(-\tilde{C} h^{-m} \log(N \wedge J)\right) h^{-1} + h^m \\
& \lesssim h^m.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t)\|_F^2 dt \\
& \lesssim_p \frac{1}{NJ} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(M_{ij}(t) (\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t)) + h^m |\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t)| \right) dt \\
& \lesssim_p \frac{1}{NJ} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij}^*(t))}{f(0)} \right) dt + \frac{h^m}{\sqrt{NJ}} \int_h^{1-h} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t)\|_F dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{G}_2^\alpha = \left\{ (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} : \frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \|\mathbf{X}'(t) - \mathbf{X}(t)\|_F^2 dt \leq (N \wedge J)^\alpha \right\}.$$

Since $\int_h^{1-h} \|\mathbf{X}'(t) - \mathbf{X}(t)\|_F^2 dt/NJ = o_p((N \wedge J)^\alpha)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{NJ} \int_h^{1-h} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 dt \\ & \lesssim_p \frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in \mathcal{G}_2^\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} \right) dt \right| + h^m (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Now we fix an arbitrary constant $\nu > 0$ which is small enough. Denote $I_0 = [0, (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2}]$ and $I_n = ((N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+(n-1)\nu}, (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+n\nu}]$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, we denote $G_{2,n} = \{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G \times G : \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}'\|_F \in I_n\}$. Then for the first term in (A.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in \mathcal{G}_2^\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} \right) dt \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in \mathcal{G}_2^\alpha} \left| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \mathbf{1}_{(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{X}'(t)) \in G_{2,n}} M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} \right) dt \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in \mathcal{G}_2^\alpha} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left[\int_h^{1-h} \mathbf{1}_{(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{X}'(t)) \in G_{2,n}} dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \sup_{(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(\tilde{X}'_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(\tilde{X}_{ij}(t))}{f(0)} \right) \right| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Note that for any $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in \mathcal{G}_2^\alpha$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\int_h^{1-h} \mathbf{1}_{(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{X}'(t)) \in G_{2,n}} dt \leq \frac{\int_h^{1-h} \|\mathbf{X}'(t) - \mathbf{X}(t)\|_F^2 dt}{(N \wedge J)^{\alpha+2(n-1)\nu}} \leq (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

So by (A.22) and (A.23) we have

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in \mathcal{G}_2^\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) dt \right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu}}{NJ} \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \sup_{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(\tilde{X}'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(\tilde{X}_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right|.$$

Now we partition a Δ -net on $[0, 1]$ with $\Delta = h^{m+3/2}/(NJ\sqrt{N \wedge J})$ and $t_k = k\Delta$, $k = 1, \dots, \tilde{K}$, where $\tilde{K} = \lceil 1/\Delta \rceil$. Then we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in \mathcal{G}_2^\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) dt \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu}}{NJ} \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \sup_{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(\tilde{X}'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(\tilde{X}_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} \left[\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{k=1, \dots, \tilde{K}: t_k \in [h, 1-h]} \sup_{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t_k) \left(\log \frac{f(\tilde{X}'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(\tilde{X}_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right| \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} \left[\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{|t-t'| \leq \Delta, t, t' \in [h, 1-h]} \sup_{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J (M_{ij}(t) - M_{ij}(t')) \left(\log \frac{f(\tilde{X}'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(\tilde{X}_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right| \right] \\ & \triangleq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} I_{1,n} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} I_{2,n}. \tag{A.24} \end{aligned}$$

We then bound the first term of (A.24) in Step 2.1 and bound the second term of (A.24) in Step 2.2.

Step 2.1: Bound $I_{1,n}$ for any fixed n .

We fix arbitrary $t \in [h, 1-h]$. For any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, with the aid of Lemma 6.3 in Ledoux and Talagrand (2013), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right|^{2p} \right] \\ & \leq 2^{2p} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_{ij} M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right|^{2p} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where ϵ_{ij} 's are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables that are independent of the $Y_{ij}(t)$'s. Now since $x \mapsto \frac{1}{L_M} \log \frac{f(x)}{f(0)}$ is a contraction on $[-M, M]$ that vanishes at $x = 0$, using Theorem 4.12 in Ledoux and Talagrand (2013) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & 2^{2p} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_{ij} M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right|^{2p} \right] \\ & \leq 2^{2p} (2L_M)^{2p} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_{ij} M_{ij}(t) (X'_{ij} - X_{ij}) \right|^{2p} \right] \\ & \leq 4^{2p} L_M^{2p} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G_{2,n}} \|\mathbf{E} \circ \mathbf{M}(t)\|_{S_{2p}}^{2p} \|\mathbf{X}' - \mathbf{X}\|_{S_{2q}}^{2p} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $1/2p + 1/2q = 1$. Here $\mathbf{E} = (\epsilon_{ij})_{i,j=1}^{N,J}$, $\|\cdot\|_{S_k}$ denote the Schatten- k norm and \circ denote Hadamard product between two matrices. For $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G_{2,n}$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{X}' - \mathbf{X}\|_{S_{2q}} \leq (2r)^{\frac{1}{2q} - \frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{X}' - \mathbf{X}\|_F \lesssim (2r)^{\frac{1}{2q} - \frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{NJ} (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2 + n\nu}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G_2^\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right|^{2p} \right] \\ & \lesssim 4^{2p} L_M^{2p} (2r)^{p-1} (NJ)^p (N \wedge J)^{\alpha p + 2np\nu} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{E} \circ \mathbf{M}(t)\|_{S_{2p}}^{2p} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, our task is to give an upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{E} \circ \mathbf{M}(t)\|_{S_{2p}}^{2p}]$. By direct calculation, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\epsilon_{ij}^2 M_{ij}(t)^2] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \right]^2 = O(h).$$

Under the context of Theorem 4.9 in Latała et al. (2018), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{p,1} &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{E} [\epsilon_{ij}^2 M_{ij}(t)^2] \right)^p \right)^{1/2p} = O \left(\frac{N^{1/2p} J^{1/2}}{h^{1/2}} \right), \\ \sigma_{p,1} &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\epsilon_{ij}^2 M_{ij}(t)^2] \right)^p \right)^{1/2p} = O \left(\frac{N^{1/2} J^{1/2p}}{h^{1/2}} \right), \\ \sigma_p^* &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \|\epsilon_{ij} M_{ij}(t)\|_\infty^{2p} \right)^{1/2p} = O \left(N^{1/2p} J^{1/2p} \sqrt{\frac{N \wedge J}{h}} \right),\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{E} \circ \mathbf{M}(t)\|_{\mathcal{S}_{2p}}^{2p} \right] \leq (\sigma_{p,1} + \sigma_{p,2} + C\sqrt{p}\sigma_p^*)^{2p}$, where $C > 0$ is a universal constant.

Hence for any $C' > 0$ (determined later), by Markov's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right| > C' p h^m (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2 + 3n\nu/2} \right) \\ & \leq (C' p N J h^m)^{-2p} (N \wedge J)^{-\alpha p - 3np\nu} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in G_{2,n}^c} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right|^{2p} \right] \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{4\sqrt{2}L_M}{C'p} \right)^{2p} r^{p-1} (NJ)^{-p} h^{-2mp} (\sigma_{p,1} + \sigma_{p,2} + C\sqrt{p}\sigma_p^*)^{2p} (N \wedge J)^{-np\nu} \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{12\sqrt{2}L_M}{C'p} \right)^{2p} r^p (NJ)^{-p} h^{-2mp} \left(\frac{NJ^p}{h^p} + \frac{N^p J}{h^p} + C^{2p} p^p NJ \left(\frac{N \wedge J}{h} \right)^p \right) (N \wedge J)^{-np\nu}.\end{aligned}$$

Now we denote $\tilde{C} = C'/12\sqrt{2}L_M\sqrt{r}$ and choose $h \asymp ((N \wedge J) / \log^2(N \wedge J))^{-1/(2m+1)}$,

$p = h^{-\nu}$ (we also assume without loss of generality that $p \geq 1$), then

$$\begin{aligned}& \left(\frac{12\sqrt{2}L_M}{C'p} \right)^{2p} r^p (NJ)^{-p} h^{-2mp} \left(\frac{NJ^p}{h^p} + \frac{N^p J}{h^p} + C^{2p} p^p NJ \left(\frac{N \wedge J}{h} \right)^p \right) \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{C}p} \right)^{2p} \left(N \left(\frac{N \wedge J}{N \log^2(N \wedge J)} \right)^p + J \left(\frac{N \wedge J}{J \log^2(N \wedge J)} \right)^p + C^{2p} p^p NJ \left(\frac{(N \wedge J)^2}{NJ \log^2(N \wedge J)} \right)^p \right) \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{C}p} \right)^{2p} (N + J + C^{2p} p^p NJ) (\log(N \wedge J))^{-2p} \\ & \lesssim \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{C}p} \right)^{2p} C^{2p} p^p NJ\end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \exp \left(-h^{-\nu} \left[2 \log \tilde{C} - 2 \log C + \nu \log(1/h) \right] + \log N + \log J \right).$$

Choose $C' = 12\sqrt{2re}L_M$, then we have $2 \log \tilde{C} - 2 \log C = 2$. Since $h^{-\nu} \gg \log N \vee \log J$

and $\nu \log(1/h) > 0$ for h small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right| > C' h^{m-\nu} (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+3n\nu/2} \right) \\ = & \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right| > C' p h^m (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+3n\nu/2} \right) \\ \lesssim & \exp(-h^{-\nu}) (N \wedge J)^{-np\nu} \\ \lesssim & \exp \left(- (N \wedge J)^{\frac{\nu}{2m+2}} \right) (N \wedge J)^{-n\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(I_{1,n} > C' h^{m-\nu} (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+3n\nu/2} \right) \\ \leq & \sum_{t_k \in [h, 1-h]} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J M_{ij}(t_k) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right| > C' h^{m-\nu} (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+3n\nu/2} \right) \\ \lesssim & \frac{1}{\Delta} \exp \left(- (N \wedge J)^{\frac{\nu}{2m+2}} \right) (N \wedge J)^{-n\nu} \\ \lesssim & NJ (N \wedge J)^{\frac{m+3/2}{2m+1} + \frac{1}{2}} (\log(N \wedge J))^{-\frac{2m+3}{2m+1}} \exp \left(- (N \wedge J)^{\frac{\nu}{2m+2}} \right) (N \wedge J)^{-n\nu} \\ \lesssim & NJ (N \wedge J)^{\frac{m+3/2}{2m+1} + \frac{1}{2} - n\nu} \exp \left(- (N \wedge J)^{\frac{\nu}{2m+2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(I_{1,n} > C' h^{m-\nu} (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+3n\nu/2} \right) \\ \leq & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} NJ (N \wedge J)^{\frac{m+3/2}{2m+1} + \frac{1}{2} - n\nu} \exp \left(- (N \wedge J)^{\frac{\nu}{2m+2}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= NJ (N \wedge J)^{\frac{m+3/2}{2m+1} + \frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(- (N \wedge J)^{\frac{\nu}{2m+2}}\right) (1 - (N \wedge J)^{-\nu})^{-1} \\
&\lesssim NJ (N \wedge J)^{\frac{m+3/2}{2m+1} + \frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(- (N \wedge J)^{\frac{\nu}{2m+2}}\right) \\
&\rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since $N \wedge J \gg \log(N \vee J)$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} I_{1,n} \geq (N \wedge J)^{2\nu+\alpha/2} C' h^{m-\nu} (1 - (N \wedge J)^{-\nu/2})^{-1}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} I_{1,n} \geq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} C' h^{m-\nu} (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+3n\nu/2}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} I_{1,n} \geq C' h^{m-\nu} (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2+3\nu/2} (1 - (N \wedge J)^{-\nu/2})^{-1}\right) \\
&\rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We finally deduce that with high probability,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} I_{1,n} \\
&\lesssim_p (N \wedge J)^{2\nu+\alpha/2} C' h^{m-\nu} (1 - (N \wedge J)^{-\nu/2})^{-1} \\
&\lesssim (N \wedge J)^{2\nu+\alpha/2-m/(2m+1)+\nu/(2m+1)} (\log(N \wedge J))^{2(m-\nu)/(2m+1)} \\
&\lesssim (N \wedge J)^{2\nu+\alpha/2-m/(2m+1)+\nu/2m}. \tag{A.25}
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2.2: Bound $I_{2,n}$ for any fixed n .

Since $K(x)$ is L_K -Lipschitz, $K'(x)$ exists almost everywhere and $|K'(x)| \leq L_K$. Then,

under A_{ij} we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{d \int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \right| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J L_K \frac{\int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s)}{h^2 \left| \int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds \right|} \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{K(0) \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s)}{\left(\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds \right)^2} \left| \frac{1}{h} K \left(\frac{1-t}{h} \right) - \frac{1}{h} K \left(\frac{-t}{h} \right) \right| \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{h^2} \int_0^1 dY_{ij}(s) \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{h^{3/2}} \sqrt{N \wedge J}.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $M_{ij}(t)$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant $\frac{C}{h^{3/2}} \sqrt{N \wedge J}$. Since $\Delta = h^{m+3/2} / (\sqrt{N \wedge J} N J)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{2,n} &= \sup_{|t-t'| \leq \Delta, t, t' \in [h, 1-h]} \sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J (M_{ij}(t) - M_{ij}(t')) \left(\log \frac{f(X'_{ij})}{f(0)} - \log \frac{f(X_{ij})}{f(0)} \right) \right| \\
&\lesssim \sup_{|t-t'| \leq \Delta, t, t' \in [h, 1-h]} \sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G_{2,n}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J |M_{ij}(t) - M_{ij}(t')| |X'_{ij} - X_{ij}| \right| \\
&\lesssim \frac{\Delta}{h^{3/2}} \sqrt{N \wedge J} \sup_{(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{X}') \in G_{2,n}} \sqrt{N J} \|\mathbf{X}' - \mathbf{X}\|_F \\
&\lesssim \frac{\Delta}{h^{3/2}} \sqrt{N \wedge J} N J (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2 + n\nu} \\
&\leq h^m (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2 + n\nu}.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have that with high probability

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (N \wedge J)^{-2(n-1)\nu} I_{2,n} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h^m (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2 + n\nu - 2(n-1)\nu} \lesssim (N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2 + 3\nu - m/(2m+1)}. \tag{A.26}$$

Step 3: Obtain the final bound.

By (A.21), (A.22), (A.24), (A.25) and (A.26), for any $\nu > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t)\|_F^2 = O_p \left((N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2 - m/(2m+1) + \max\{3\nu, 3\nu/2 + \nu/2m\}} \right),$$

which also implies that

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t)\|_F^2 = o_p \left((N \wedge J)^{\alpha/2 - m/(2m+1) + 3\nu} \right).$$

Therefore, as long as $\alpha > -2m/(2m+1)$, we can repeat the above procedure to obtain a sharper rate. Finally, we conclude that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t)\|_F^2 = O_p \left((N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1) + \delta} \right),$$

which completes the proof. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof of Theorem 2 is based on the following lemma, whose proof will be provided later in the Appendix B.

Lemma 3 (Varshamov-Gilbert). *Let $\Omega = \{\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N) : \omega_j \in \{0, 1\}\}$. Suppose that $N \geq 8$. There exists $\omega^0, \dots, \omega^M \in \Omega$ such that (i) $\omega^0 = (0, \dots, 0)$, (ii) $M \geq 2^{N/8}$, and (iii) $H(\omega^j, \omega^k) \geq N/8$ for $0 \leq j < k \leq M$, here $H(\omega, \nu) = \sum_{i=1}^N I(\omega_i \neq \nu_i)$ is the Hamming Distance between ω and ν . We call $\Omega' = \{\omega^0, \dots, \omega^M\}$ a pruned hypercube.*

Proof of Theorem 2. We proceed with the following two steps:

Step 1. Packing Set Construction: First, set $g(t)$ to be a sufficiently smooth function which is supported on $[0, 1]$, satisfying $\sup_{[0,1]} |g(t)| \leq M$ and $\sup_{[0,1]} |g^{(m)}(t)| \leq M$. Let

$n \in \mathbb{N}$ to be determined later and define

$$g_k(t) = \frac{1}{n^m} g(nt - (k-1)), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Then $g_k(t)$ is supported on $[(k-1)/n, k/n]$, $\sup_{[0,1]} |g_k(t)| \leq M$ and

$$\left| \frac{d^m}{dt^m} g_k(t) \right| = |g^{(m)}(nt - (k-1))| \leq M, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

Now without loss of generality we assume $N \leq J$. According to Lemma 3, as long as $nrJ \geq 8$, we can construct a pruned hypercube Ω' of $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^{r \times J \times n}$, with $|\Omega'| \geq 2^{nrJ/8}$ and $\forall \omega, \nu \in \Omega', \omega \neq \nu$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^n I(\omega_{ij}^k \neq \nu_{ij}^k) \geq \frac{nrJ}{8}.$$

Now we construct our packing set through Ω' as $G'_T = \{\mathbf{X}^\omega(t) : \omega \in \Omega'\}$. We know that $|G'_T| \geq 2^{nrJ/8}$. And $\forall \omega \in \Omega', \mathbf{X}^\omega(t)$ is an $N \times J$ matrix-valued function on $[0, 1]$, defined element-wisely by

$$X_{ij}^\omega(t) = \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_{i(\bmod r), j}^k g_k(t).$$

Intuitively, for $1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq J$ we define the first $r \times J$ block of $\mathbf{X}^\omega(t)$ by $X_{ij}^\omega(t) = \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_{ij}^k g_k(t)$, then copy this block several times until the whole matrix is defined. It's easy to verify that $\mathbf{X}^\omega \in \mathcal{G}$ and satisfies Condition 2, and for any $\omega, \nu \in \Omega', \omega \neq \nu$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\mathbf{X}^\omega(t) - \mathbf{X}^\nu(t)\|_F^2 dt &= \frac{1}{NJ} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 (X_{ij}^\omega(t) - X_{ij}^\nu(t))^2 dt \\ &\geq \frac{1}{NJ} \left\lfloor \frac{N}{r} \right\rfloor \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^n (\omega_{ij}^k - \nu_{ij}^k) g_k(t) \right)^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{NJ} \left[\frac{N}{r} \right] \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 \sum_{k=1}^n (\omega_{ij}^k - \nu_{ij}^k)^2 g_k(t)^2 dt \\
&= \frac{1}{NJn^{2m+1}} \left[\frac{N}{r} \right] \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^n I(\omega_{ij}^k \neq \nu_{ij}^k) \int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt \\
&\geq \frac{r}{8Nn^{2m}} \left[\frac{N}{r} \right] \int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt \geq \frac{1}{16n^{2m}} \int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt.
\end{aligned}$$

And similarly we can show that

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\mathbf{X}^\omega(t) - \mathbf{X}^\nu(t)\|_F^2 dt \leq \frac{1}{n^{2m}} \int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt.$$

Step 2. Utilize Fano's inequality to give a lower bound:

Let $\epsilon^2 = \int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt / (64n^{2m})$. For any $\mathbf{X}^\omega(t) \in G'_T$, denote its estimator as $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^\omega(t)$ and we choose its L^2 -projection to G'_T as

$$\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) = \arg \min_{\omega^* \in \Omega'} \frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{X}}^\omega(t)\|_F^2 dt.$$

We note that if $\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) \neq \mathbf{X}^\omega(t)$, and

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^\omega(t) - \mathbf{X}^\omega(t)\|_F^2 dt < \epsilon^2,$$

then we must have

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{X}}^\omega(t)\|_F^2 dt > \epsilon^2 > \frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^\omega(t) - \mathbf{X}^\omega(t)\|_F^2 dt,$$

since

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\mathbf{X}^\omega(t) - \mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t)\|_F^2 dt \geq 4\epsilon^2,$$

as proved in Step 1. However, this contradicts the definition of $\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t)$ and we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{\omega}(t) - \mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t)\|_F^2 dt < \epsilon^2 \text{ implies } \mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) = \mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t).$$

Now we proceed our proof by contradiction, assume that for any $\mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t) \in G'_T$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{\omega}(t) - \mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t)\|_F^2 dt < \epsilon^2 \right) > \frac{1}{2},$$

then we immediately obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) = \mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t)) > \frac{1}{2} \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) \neq \mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t)) < \frac{1}{2},$$

here the probability is taken over a uniform prior on G'_T and the distribution of $\mathbf{Y}^{\omega}(t)$, the multivariate Poisson process associated to $\mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t)$.

Since $\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t)$ only depends on $\mathbf{Y}^{\omega}(t)$, using Fano's inequality gives us

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) \neq \mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t)) \geq 1 - \frac{\log 2 + |G'_T|^{-2} \sum_{\omega, \nu \in \Omega'} D_{KL}(\mathbf{Y}^{\omega}(t) \parallel \mathbf{Y}^{\nu}(t))}{\log |G'_T|}.$$

Note that for multivariate Poisson processes $\mathbf{Y}^{\omega}(t)$ and $\mathbf{Y}^{\nu}(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(\mathbf{Y}^{\omega}(t) \parallel \mathbf{Y}^{\nu}(t)) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J D_{KL}(Y_{ij}^{\omega}(t) \parallel Y_{ij}^{\nu}(t)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 \left(X_{ij}^{\omega}(t) \log \frac{X_{ij}^{\omega}(t)}{X_{ij}^{\nu}(t)} - (X_{ij}^{\omega}(t) - X_{ij}^{\nu}(t)) \right) dt \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \sup_{|x| \leq M} \frac{f'(x)^2}{f(x)} \int_0^1 (X_{ij}^{\omega}(t) - X_{ij}^{\nu}(t))^2 dt \\ &= \sup_{|x| \leq M} \frac{f'(x)^2}{f(x)} \int_0^1 \|\mathbf{X}^{\omega}(t) - \mathbf{X}^{\nu}(t)\|_F^2 dt \leq \sup_{|x| \leq M} \frac{f'(x)^2}{f(x)} \frac{NJ}{n^{2m}} \int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\log |G'_T| \geq nrJ \log 2/8$, therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) \neq \mathbf{X}^\omega(t)) \geq 1 - \frac{8}{nrJ} - \frac{8N \sup_{|x| \leq M} \frac{f'(x)^2}{f(x)} \int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt}{n^{2m+1} r \log 2}.$$

Now as long as $rJ \geq 32$ (if $rJ < 32$ there are only finitely many cases) we choose

$$n = \left[\left(\frac{32}{\log 2} \sup_{|x| \leq M} \frac{f'(x)^2}{f(x)} \int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt \right)^{1/(2m+1)} \left(\frac{N}{r} \right)^{1/(2m+1)} \right] + 1,$$

getting to $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}^{\omega^*}(t) \neq \mathbf{X}^\omega(t)) \geq 1/2$, and existence of an absolute constant C such that

$$\epsilon^2 = \frac{\int_0^1 g(t)^2 dt}{64n^{2m}} \geq C \left(\frac{N}{r} \right)^{-2m/(2m+1)},$$

a contradiction. Therefore $\exists \mathbf{X}^\omega(t) \in G'_T$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{NJ} \int_0^1 \|\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^\omega(t) - \mathbf{X}^\omega(t)\|_F^2 dt \geq C \left(\frac{N}{r} \right)^{-2m/(2m+1)} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

which completes the proof. □

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof of Theorem 3. We first prove the first part of Theorem 3.

We only need to prove that $\text{IC}(r^*) > \text{IC}(r)$ holds with probability converging to 0 for any $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and $r \neq r^*$. We denote $\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}$ as the estimator obtained when we fix the rank to be r . Then we separately discuss the case when r is smaller or bigger than r^* . For notational simplicity, we define

$$\mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J f(X_{ij}(t)) \log f(X_{ij}(t))$$

and define

$$\mathcal{G}_r = \{\mathbf{X}(\cdot) = \Theta(\cdot)\mathbf{A}^\top : \Theta \in L^2_{N \times r}[0, 1], \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times r}, \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \|\Theta(t)\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M, \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M\}$$

for fixed $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Now we discuss the two cases when r is smaller or larger than r^* separately.

Case 1: $r < r^*$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{IC}(r^*) - \text{IC}(r) \\ &= -2 \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r^*)}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right) dt + v(N, J, r^*) - v(N, J, r) \\ &\leq -2 \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right) dt + v(N, J, r^*) - v(N, J, r) \\ &\leq 4 \int_h^{1-h} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{G}_{r^*}} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| dt + 4 \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{G}_{r^*}} \left| \int_h^{1-h} [\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}(t)) - \mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}(t))] dt \right| \\ &\quad - 2 \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right) dt + (v(N, J, r^*) - v(N, J, r)) \\ &\triangleq 4I_1 + 4I_2 - 2I_3 + I_4. \end{aligned} \tag{A.27}$$

In the following steps, we bound each of I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4 .

Step 1: Bound I_1 .

By the proof of the first part of Theorem 1, we have shown that $I_1 = O_p(NJh^m)$.

Step 2: Bound I_2 .

For any $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{G}_{r^*}$, by Lemma 2 we have

$$\left| \int_h^{1-h} (\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}(t)) - \mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}(t))) dt \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) f(X_{ij}(s)) ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} - f(X_{ij}(t)) \right| |\log f(X_{ij}(t))| dt \\
&\leq TNJC_m h^m \sup_{|x| \leq M} |\log f(x)|.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have $I_2 \lesssim NJh^m$.

Step 3: For the third term, for any t in $[h, 1-h]$, by Lemma 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left(X_{ij}^{(r)}(t) - X_{ij}^*(t) \right)^2 \\
&\leq 4\beta_M \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \left(f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \log \frac{f(X_{ij}^*(t))}{f(\widehat{X}_{ij}^{(r)}(t))} - (f(X_{ij}^*(t)) - f(\widehat{X}_{ij}^{(r^*)}(t))) \right) \\
&= 4\beta_M \left(\mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 &= \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right) dt \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\beta_M} \int_h^{1-h} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t) - \mathbf{X}^*(t) \right\|_F^2 dt \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\beta_M} \int_h^{1-h} \sigma_{r^*,t}^2 dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we use Weyl's inequality for singular values.

Step 4: For the last term I_4 , by the assumption of Theorem 3, we have

$$I_4 = v(N, J, r^*) - v(N, J, r) = o\left(\int_h^{1-h} \sigma_{r^*,t}^2 dt \right).$$

Since $NJ(J/\phi(J))^{-m/(2m+1)+\delta} = o(u(N, J, r))$ for some $\delta > 0$, for $h = (\phi(J)/J)^{(1-\delta)/(2m+1)}$,

by (A.27) we have $\lim_{N, J \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{IC}(r^*) > \text{IC}(r)) = 0$.

Case 2: $r^* < r$.

Denote maximum element in \mathcal{R} by r_{\max} . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{IC}(r^*) - \text{IC}(r) \\
&= -2 \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r^*)}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right) dt + v(N, J, r^*) - v(N, J, r) \\
&\leq -2 \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right) dt + v(N, J, r^*) - v(N, J, r) \\
&\leq 4 \int_h^{1-h} \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{G}_{r_{\max}}} |\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})| dt + 4 \sup_{\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{G}_{r_{\max}}} \left| \int_h^{1-h} (\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}(t)) - \mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}(t))) dt \right| \\
&\quad + 2 \left| \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) - \mathcal{J}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right) dt \right| - (v(N, J, r) - v(N, J, r^*)) \\
&\triangleq 4I_1 + 4I_2 + 2I_3 - I_4. \tag{A.28}
\end{aligned}$$

We can use the same method as in Case 1 to prove that $I_1/NJ = O_p\left(\left(J/\phi(J)\right)^{-m/(2m+1)+\delta}\right)$ and $I_2 = O\left(\left(J/\phi(J)\right)^{-m/(2m+1)+\delta}\right)$. Moreover, by the proof of the first part in Theorem 1, we have $I_3 = O_p\left(\left(J/\phi(J)\right)^{-m/(2m+1)+\delta}\right)$. By the assumption of Theorem 3, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NJ} I_4 / \left(J/\phi(J)\right)^{-m/(2m+1)+\delta} \rightarrow \infty.$$

So by (A.28) we have $\lim_{N, J \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{IC}(r^*) > \text{IC}(r)) = 0$. Hence by the proof in Case 1 and

Case 2, we verified that

$$\lim_{N, J \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{r} = r^*) = 1.$$

Then we prove the second part of Theorem 3 similarly. We separately discuss the case when $r < r^*$ and $r^* < r$. The proof in the first case is the same as in the first part, so we only discuss the second case.

For convenience, we denote $Z_{ij}(t) = \log f(X_{ij}(t))$, $\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{Z}) = \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X})$, and so on. We omit $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}^{(r)}$ as $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$. By the proof of the second part in Theorem 1, for any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t)\|_F^2 = O_p \left(NJ(N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} \right).$$

Using Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 \leq \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{Z}^*(t)) \right) dt \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} \left(\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t) \right) - \left(f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t)) - f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \right) \right) dt \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \left(\frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) dY_{ij}(s)}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} - f(X_{ij}^*(t)) \right) \left(\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t) \right) dt \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J \int_h^{1-h} \frac{e^{\widetilde{Z}_{ij}(t)}}{2} \left(\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t) - Z_{ij}^*(t) \right)^2 dt \\ &\triangleq I_1 - I_2, \end{aligned} \tag{A.29}$$

where $\widetilde{Z}_{ij}(t)$ is some real number between $Z_{ij}^*(t)$ and $\widehat{Z}_{ij}(t)$. By the proof of the second part in Theorem 1, $I_1 = O_p \left(NJ(N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} \right)$. Since $e^{\widetilde{Z}_{ij}(t)} \geq \min(f(X_{ij}^*(t)), f(\widehat{X}_{ij}(t))) \geq \inf_{|x| \leq M} f(x)$, it follows that

$$|I_2| \lesssim T \sup_{t \in [h, 1-h]} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t) - \mathbf{Z}^*(t)\|_F^2 = O_p \left(NJ(N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} \right).$$

Then by (A.29) we have

$$\int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}^{(r)}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{Z}^*(t)) \right) dt = O_p \left(NJ(N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} \right).$$

So we proved that for any $r^* \leq r \leq r_{max}$,

$$\int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) \right) dt = O_p \left(NJ(N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} \right)$$

for $\delta > 0$ small enough. Since we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{IC}(r^*) - \text{IC}(r) \\ &= -2 \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r^*)}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) \right) dt + v(N, J, r^*) - v(N, J, r) \\ &\leq -2 \left[\int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r^*)}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) \right) dt - \int_h^{1-h} \left(\mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\widehat{\mathbf{X}}^{(r)}(t)) - \mathcal{L}_{t,h}(\mathbf{X}^*(t)) \right) dt \right] + u(N, J, r) \\ &= O_p \left(NJ(N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} \right) + u(N, J, r) \end{aligned}$$

and $NJ(N \wedge J)^{-2m/(2m+1)+\delta} = o(u(N, J, r))$, we have $\lim_{N, J \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{IC}(r^*) > \text{IC}(r)) = 0$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 3. \square

B Proof of lemmas

Proof of Lemma 1. Using the well-known inequality $-\log x \geq 1 - x$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} f(a) \log \frac{f(a)}{f(b)} - (f(a) - f(b)) &= -2f(a) \log \frac{\sqrt{f(b)}}{\sqrt{f(a)}} - (f(a) - f(b)) \\ &\geq 2f(a) \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{f(b)}}{\sqrt{f(a)}} \right) - (f(a) - f(b)) \\ &= \left(\sqrt{f(a)} - \sqrt{f(b)} \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\int_b^a \frac{f'(t)}{2\sqrt{f(t)}} dt \right)^2 \\ &\geq (a - b)^2 \inf_{|x| \leq \alpha} \frac{f'(x)^2}{4f(x)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $(a - b)^2 \leq 4\beta_\alpha \left(f(a) \log \frac{f(a)}{f(b)} - (f(a) - f(b)) \right)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Using Taylor series expansion, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)f(X_{ij}(s)) ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} - f(X_{ij}(t)) = \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(f(X_{ij}(s)) - f(X_{ij}(t))) ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k}{dt^k} f(X_{ij}(t)) \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(s-t)^k ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} + \frac{1}{m!} \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) \frac{d^m}{du^m} f(X_{ij}(u))(s-t)^m ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds}, \end{aligned}$$

where $u = \theta s + (1 - \theta)t$. Now under Condition 3, if $h \leq t \leq 1 - h$, it's easy to show that for $k = 1, \dots, m - 1$,

$$\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(s-t)^k ds = 0.$$

According to Condition 2, $\left| \frac{d^m}{du^m} f(X_{ij}(u)) \right| \leq M$, hence we have

$$\left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)f(X_{ij}(s)) ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} - f(X_{ij}(t)) \right| \leq \frac{M}{m!} h^m \int_{-1}^1 |K(x)| |x|^m dx.$$

Choose $C_m = \frac{M}{m!} \int_{-1}^1 |K(x)| |x|^m dx$, we complete the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 2 under Condition 3'. Using Taylor series expansion, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)f(X_{ij}(s)) ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} - f(X_{ij}(t)) = \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(f(X_{ij}(s)) - f(X_{ij}(t))) ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k}{dt^k} f(X_{ij}(t)) \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(s-t)^k ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds} + \frac{1}{m!} \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) \frac{d^m}{du^m} f(X_{ij}(u))(s-t)^m ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s)ds}, \end{aligned}$$

where $u = \theta s + (1 - \theta)t$. Now under Condition 3', if $h^{1-\epsilon} \leq t \leq 1 - h^{1-\epsilon}$, it's easy to show

that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_0^1 K_h(t-s)(s-t)^k ds \right| &= h^k \left| \int_{\frac{t-1}{h}}^{\frac{t}{h}} x^k K(x) dx \right| \\
&= h^k \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{t-1}{h}} x^k K(x) dx + \int_{\frac{t}{h}}^{\infty} x^k K(x) dx \right| \\
&\leq h^k \int_{-\infty}^{-h^{-\epsilon}} x^k |K(x)| dx + \int_{h^{-\epsilon}}^{\infty} x^k |K(x)| dx \\
&\lesssim h^k h^{m-k} \\
&= h^m.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that $\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds \rightarrow 1$ as $h \downarrow 0$. So we can choose constant $C_m > 0$ such that the following holds when $h > 0$ is small enough:

$$\left| \frac{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) f(X_{ij}(s)) ds}{\int_0^1 K_h(t-s) ds} - f(X_{ij}(t)) \right| \leq C_m h^m.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Let $D = \lfloor N/8 \rfloor$. Set $\omega^0 = (0, \dots, 0)$. Define $\Omega_0 = \Omega$ and $\Omega_1 = \{\omega \in \Omega : H(\omega, \omega^0) > D\}$. Let ω^1 be any element in Ω_1 . We continue recursively and at the j -th step we get $\Omega_j = \{\omega \in \Omega_{j-1} : H(\omega, \omega^{j-1}) > D\}$, and $\omega^j \in \Omega_j$, where $j = 1, \dots, M$, until Ω_{M+1} is empty. Let n_j be the number of elements in set $A_j = \{\omega \in \Omega_j : H(\omega, \omega^j) \leq D\}$, $j = 0, \dots, M$. It follows clearly that

$$n_j \leq \sum_{i=0}^D \binom{N}{i}. \tag{A.30}$$

Since the sets A_0, \dots, A_M form a partition of Ω , $\sum_{j=0}^M n_j = 2^N$. Thus,

$$(M+1) \sum_{i=0}^D \binom{N}{i} \geq 2^N, \quad (\text{A.31})$$

leading to

$$M+1 \geq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=0}^D 2^{-N} \binom{N}{i}} = \frac{1}{\text{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \leq D\right)}, \quad (\text{A.32})$$

where Z_1, \dots, Z_N are i.i.d. $\text{Ber}(1/2)$ random variables. By Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\text{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \leq D\right) = \text{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \leq \left\lfloor \frac{N}{8} \right\rfloor\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{9N}{32}\right) < 2^{-N/4}. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Therefore $M \geq 2^{N/8}$ as long as $N \geq 8$. And finally note that by our construction, $H(\omega^j, \omega^k) \geq D+1 > N/8$ for any $j \neq k$. \square

C Computation Algorithm

We propose an projected gradient descent algorithm for optimizing the discretized pseudo-likelihood (6). To handle the constraints in our problem, a projected gradient descent update is used in each iteration. For vector \mathbf{x} , we define the following projection operator:

$$\text{Proc}_M(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \min_{\|\mathbf{y}\| \leq M} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\| = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x} & \text{if } \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq M, \\ M\mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\| & \text{if } \|\mathbf{x}\| > M. \end{cases}$$

Algorithm 1 (Projected gradient descent algorithm).

Input: Data $\{Y_{ij}(t) : t \in [0, 1], i = 1, \dots, N, j = 1, \dots, J\}$, pre-specified dimension r , constraint M .

We partition interval $[h, 1 - h]$ by q evenly separated time points t_1, \dots, t_q . We set iteration number $m = 1$, initial values $\Theta^{(0)}(t_1) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(0)}(t_1), \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_N^{(0)}(t_1)), \dots, \Theta^{(0)}(t_q) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(0)}(t_q), \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_N^{(0)}(t_q))$ and $\mathbf{A}^{(0)} = (\mathbf{a}_1^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_J^{(0)})$.

Update: At the m -th iteration, perform:

For each respondent i and time node t_l , update

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(m)}(t_l) = \text{Proc}_M \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^{(m-1)}(t_l) + \rho \mathbf{s}_{i,l}^{(m-1)}(\Theta^{(m-1)}, \mathbf{A}^{(m-1)}) \right),$$

where

$$\mathbf{s}_{i,l}^{(m-1)}(\Theta, \mathbf{A}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_i(t_l)} \mathcal{L}_h(\Theta(t_1), \dots, \Theta(t_q), \mathbf{A}).$$

For each item j , update

$$\mathbf{a}_j^{(m)} = \text{Proc}_M \left(\mathbf{a}_j^{(m-1)} + \rho \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^{(m-1)}(\Theta^{(m-1)}, \mathbf{A}^{(m-1)}) \right),$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^{(m-1)}(\Theta, \mathbf{A}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{a}_j} \mathcal{L}_h(\Theta(t_1), \dots, \Theta(t_q), \mathbf{A}).$$

The step size $\rho > 0$ is chosen by backtracking line search. Iterate this step until convergence.

Let \tilde{m} be the last iteration number upon convergence.

Output: $\hat{\mathbf{X}}(t_l) = \Theta^{(\tilde{m})}(t_l)(\mathbf{A}^{(\tilde{m})})^T$ for each $l = 1, \dots, q$.

The following theorem guarantees the convergence of Algorithm 1 to a critical point of the discretized pseudo-likelihood.

Theorem 4. Denote the parameters obtained in the k -th update by $\Theta^{(k)} = (\Theta^{(k)}(t_1), \dots, \Theta^{(k)}(t_q))$ and $\mathbf{A}^{(k)}$. Then $\Theta^{(k)} \rightarrow \Theta = (\Theta(t_1), \dots, \Theta(t_q))$ and $\mathbf{A}^{(k)} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$, where $\max_{l=1, \dots, q} \|\Theta(t_l)\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M$ and $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M$ and (Θ, \mathbf{A}) is a critical point of $\mathcal{L}_h(\Theta(t_1), \dots, \Theta(t_q), \mathbf{A})$.

Remark 17. In simulation studies, \mathcal{L}_h usually have only one critical point, which is its unique global maximum point.

Proof of Theorem 4. For notational simplicity, we denote:

$$\mathcal{H} = \{\Theta(t_1), \dots, \Theta(t_q), \mathbf{A} : \max_{l=1, \dots, q} \|\Theta(t_l)\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M, \|\mathbf{A}\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq M\}.$$

Furthermore, denote the projection operator in algorithm by \mathcal{P} . We first prove that \mathcal{P} is the projection operator on compact set \mathcal{H} . For any $\gamma = (\Theta, \mathbf{A}) \triangleq (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$, where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $K = qN + J$. Then $\mathcal{P}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K) = (\text{Proc}_M(\alpha_1), \dots, \text{Proc}_M(\alpha_K))$. Then for any $\tilde{\gamma} = (\tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_K) \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (\tilde{\alpha}_1 - \text{Proc}_M(\alpha_1), \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_K - \text{Proc}_M(\alpha_K)), (\alpha_1 - \text{Proc}_M(\alpha_1), \dots, \alpha_K - \text{Proc}_M(\alpha_K)) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \langle \tilde{\alpha}_k - \text{Proc}_M(\alpha_k), \alpha_k - \text{Proc}_M(\alpha_k) \rangle \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that \mathcal{P} is the projection operator on compact set \mathcal{H} . By the projected gradient descent algorithm, there holds: $\gamma^{(k)} = (\Theta^{(k)}, \mathbf{A}^{(k)}) \in \mathcal{H}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $\gamma = (\Theta, \mathbf{A}) \in \mathcal{H}$ is a limit point of its subsequence, i.e., $\gamma^{(k_n)} \rightarrow \gamma$. We first prove that $\gamma = (\Theta, \mathbf{A})$ is a critical point, i.e.,

$$\nabla^T \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma) \leq 0$$

for any $\tilde{\gamma} = (\tilde{\Theta}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \in \mathcal{H}$. If not, then $\nabla^T \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma) > 0$ for fixed $\tilde{\gamma} = (\tilde{\Theta}, \tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \in \mathcal{H}$. Since by the algorithm, $\mathcal{L}_h(\gamma^{(k)})$ is strictly increasing, we can deduce that if we input γ as the parameter value in the initial step, the algorithm will stop updating or update γ to itself.

Case 1: If the algorithm stop updating, then for any $\rho > 0$ and $\gamma_\rho \triangleq \mathcal{P}(\gamma + \rho \nabla \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma))$, we have $\mathcal{L}_h(\gamma_\rho) \leq \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)$. We first prove that for any $\rho > 0$, we have

$$\nabla^T \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)(\gamma_\rho - \gamma) < 0.$$

If not, i.e., $\nabla^T \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)(\gamma_\rho - \gamma) \geq 0$. Denote $\gamma + \rho \nabla \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma) = \gamma_\rho + v$. Then by the projection property, we have $(\gamma_\rho - \gamma)^T v \geq 0$. So we have

$$-\|\gamma_\rho - \gamma\|_2^2 = (\gamma_\rho - \gamma)^T (v - \rho \nabla \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)) \geq 0,$$

which implies that $\gamma_\rho = \gamma$. This falls into Case 2. Hence for any $\rho > 0$, we have $\nabla^T \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)(\gamma_\rho - \gamma) < 0$. Then for $\rho > 0$ small enough, we have $\mathcal{L}_h(\gamma) < \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma_\rho)$, which leads to contradiction.

Case 2: If the algorithm update γ to itself. Then for any $\rho > 0$, we have $\mathcal{P}(\gamma + \rho \nabla \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)) = \gamma$. Then for any $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma)^T (\gamma + \rho \nabla \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma) - \gamma) \leq 0.$$

Hence $\nabla^T \mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)(\tilde{\gamma} - \gamma) \leq 0$ for any $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{H}$. So we prove that γ is a critical point. By this proof, we can also show that the algorithm will stop updating on a critical point. This indicates that there can be only one limit point among $\gamma^{(k)}, k = 1, 2, \dots$. Hence we proved that $\gamma^{(k)}$ converges to a critical point of $\mathcal{L}_h(\gamma)$. \square

D Details of Simulation Settings

We provide the detailed settings of the simulations in Section 4. In each simulation, we consider three cases regarding the true parameter matrix $\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)\mathbf{A}^T$:

C1 \mathbf{X} takes constant value on $[0, 1]$, i.e., $\Theta(t)$ takes constant value on $[0, 1]$.

C2 \mathbf{X} is linear on $[0, 1]$, i.e., $\Theta(t)$ changes linearly on $[0, 1]$.

C3 \mathbf{X} changes periodically on $[0, 1]$, i.e., $\Theta(t)$ changes periodically on $[0, 1]$.

The detailed version of the data generating mechanism is given as: The true dimension is chosen to $r = 3$ and link function is chosen as $f(x) = \exp(x)$. Diverging sequences of J and N are considered, by letting $J = 200, 400, 600, 800$. We consider three cases (C1, C2, C3) under three general settings (S1, S2):

(S1) Let $N = 2J$.

C1 Generate Θ , \mathbf{A} by $\Theta_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.8, 1.8)$ and $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.8, 1.8)$. Let $\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)\mathbf{A}^T$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

C2 Generate $\Theta(0)$, \mathbf{A} by $\Theta_{ij}(0) \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.6, 1.6)$ and $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.6, 1.6)$. Generate linear coefficient $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$ by $B_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-4, 4)$ and let $\Theta_{ij}(t) = B_{ij}t + \Theta_{ij}(0)$. Let $\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)\mathbf{A}^T$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

C3 Generate $\Theta(0)$, \mathbf{A} by $\Theta_{ij}(0) \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.6, 1.6)$ and $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.6, 1.6)$. Choose the period as $T_0 = 1$. Generate amplitude coefficient $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$ and phase coefficient $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$ by $S_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.2, 1.2)$ and $W_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(0, T_0)$. Let $\Theta_{ij}(t) = \Theta_{ij}(0) + S_{ij} \sin(2\pi(t - W_{ij})/T_0)$ and let $\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)\mathbf{A}^T$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

(S2) Let $N = 2J$.

Kernel method	S1			S2		
	C1	C2	C3	C1	C2	C3
$J = 200$	0.0391	0.0457	0.0481	0.0497	0.0554	0.0576
$J = 400$	0.0212	0.0246	0.0262	0.0267	0.0302	0.0315
$J = 600$	0.0150	0.0174	0.0185	0.0189	0.0213	0.0222
$J = 800$	0.0117	0.0137	0.0145	0.0147	0.0167	0.0174
Poisson regression	C1	C2	C3	C1	C2	C3
$J = 200$	0.0065	1.1730	0.6290	0.0081	0.8303	0.4564
$J = 400$	0.0032	1.1820	0.6260	0.0040	0.8283	0.4592
$J = 600$	0.0021	1.2052	0.6344	0.0027	0.8320	0.4627
$J = 800$	0.0016	1.2104	0.6368	0.0020	0.8348	0.4620

Table 4: Mean prediction error among 50 independent replications under proposed kernel-based method and rank constraint Poisson regression in each of the 24 simulation settings.

C1 Generate Θ , \mathbf{A} by $\Theta_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.8, 1.8)$, $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.8, 1.8)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r-1, j = 1, \dots, J$ and $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-0.9, 0.9)$ for $i = r, j = 1, \dots, J$. Let $\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)\mathbf{A}^T$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

C2 Generate $\Theta(0)$, \mathbf{A} by $\Theta_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.6, 1.6)$, $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.6, 1.6)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r-1, j = 1, \dots, J$ and $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-0.8, 0.8)$ for $i = r, j = 1, \dots, J$. Generate linear coefficient $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$ by $B_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-4, 4)$ and let $\Theta_{ij}(t) = B_{ij}t + \Theta_{ij}(0)$. Let $\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)\mathbf{A}^T$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

C3 Generate $\Theta(0)$, \mathbf{A} by $\Theta_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.6, 1.6)$, $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.6, 1.6)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r-1, j = 1, \dots, J$ and $A_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-0.8, 0.8)$ for $i = r, j = 1, \dots, J$. Choose the period as $T_0 = 1$. Generate amplitude coefficient $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$ and phase coefficient $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times N}$ by $S_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(-1.2, 1.2)$ and $W_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(0, T_0)$. Let $\Theta_{ij}(t) = \Theta_{ij}(0) + S_{ij} \sin(2\pi(t - W_{ij})/T_0)$ and let $\mathbf{X}(t) = \Theta(t)\mathbf{A}^T$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

Under independent-event-type settings, the results regarding the estimation errors are given in Table 4, which show similar results as in the settings where the event types are dependent.

We then evaluate the accuracy regarding selecting the number of factors. In the information criterion, we set the penalty term to be $v(N, J, r) = 3000rN Jh^{3.98}$ and select r from the

candidate set $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Similar to our simulation results when the event types are dependent, the number of factors is always correctly selected under all the simulation settings.

References

- Abu-Libdeh, H., Turnbull, B. W., and Clark, L. C. (1990). Analysis of multi-type recurrent events in longitudinal studies; application to a skin cancer prevention trial. *Biometrics*, 46:1017–1034.
- Andersen, P. K., Borgan, O., Gill, R. D., and Keiding, N. (1993). *Statistical models based on counting processes*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Bai, J. and Li, K. (2012). Statistical analysis of factor models of high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40:436–465.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*, 70(1):191–221.
- Bogdanowicz, A. and Guan, C. (2022). Dynamic topic modeling of twitter data during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Plos One*, 17(5):1–22.
- Browne, M. W. (2001). An overview of analytic rotation in exploratory factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 36(1):111–150.
- Chen, B. E., Cook, R. J., Lawless, J. F., and Zhan, M. (2005). Statistical methods for multivariate interval-censored recurrent events. *Statistics in Medicine*, 24(5):671–691.
- Chen, L., Dolado, J. J., and Gonzalo, J. (2021). Quantile factor models. *Econometrica*, 89(2):875–910.
- Chen, Y. (2016). Thinning algorithms for simulating point processes. *Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL*.

- Chen, Y. (2020). A continuous-time dynamic choice measurement model for problem-solving process data. *Psychometrika*, 85(4):1052–1075.
- Chen, Y. and Li, X. (2022). Determining the number of factors in high-dimensional generalized latent factor models. *Biometrika*, 109(3):769–782.
- Chen, Y., Li, X., and Zhang, S. (2020). Structured latent factor analysis for large-scale data: Identifiability, estimability, and their implications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(532):1756–1770.
- Chen, Y. and Zhang, S. (2020). A latent gaussian process model for analysing intensive longitudinal data. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 73:237–260.
- Cook, R. J. and Lawless, J. F. (2007). *The statistical analysis of recurrent events*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Ferguson, D. (2013). How supermarkets get your data—and what they do with it. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/money/2013/jun/08/supermarkets-get-your-data>. Accessed 4 March, 2024.
- Györfi, L., Kohler, M., Krzyzak, A., and Walk, H. (2002). *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 23(3):187–200.
- Latała, R., van Handel, R., and Youssef, P. (2018). The dimension-free structure of non-homogeneous random matrices. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 214(3):1031–1080.

- Ledoux, M. and Talagrand, M. (2013). *Probability in Banach Spaces: isoperimetry and processes*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Liang, S., Zhang, X., Ren, Z., and Kanoulas, E. (2018). Dynamic embeddings for user profiling in twitter. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '18*, page 1764–1773, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Lin, D. Y., Wei, L.-J., Yang, I., and Ying, Z. (2000). Semiparametric regression for the mean and rate functions of recurrent events. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 62(4):711–730.
- Liu, W., Lin, H., Zheng, S., and Liu, J. (2023). Generalized factor model for ultra-high dimensional correlated variables with mixed types. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(542):1385–1401.
- Lu, Z.-H., Chow, S.-M., Sherwood, A., and Zhu, H. (2015). Bayesian analysis of ambulatory blood pressure dynamics with application to irregularly spaced sparse data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 9(3):1601.
- Rohe, K. and Zeng, M. (2023). Vintage factor analysis with varimax performs statistical inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 85(4):1037–1060.
- Sun, J. (2006). *The statistical analysis of interval-censored failure time data*. Springer, New York, NY.
- Tang, N., Chow, S.-M., Ibrahim, J. G., and Zhu, H. (2017). Bayesian sensitivity analysis

of a nonlinear dynamic factor analysis model with nonparametric prior and possible nonignorable missingness. *Psychometrika*, 82(4):875–903.

Wedel, M. and Kamakura, W. A. (2001). Factor analysis with (mixed) observed and latent variables in the exponential family. *Psychometrika*, 66(4):515–530.

Xia, Z. and Qiu, P. (2015). Jump information criterion for statistical inference in estimating discontinuous curves. *Biometrika*, 102(2):397–408.

Yang, L. (2022). Nonparametric copula estimation for mixed insurance claim data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 40(2):537–546.