

INFERENCE IN MATRIX-VALUED TIME SERIES WITH COMMON STOCHASTIC TRENDS AND MULTIFACTOR ERROR STRUCTURE

RONG CHEN, SIMONE GIANNERINI, GRETA GORACCI, AND LORENZO TRAPANI

ABSTRACT. We develop an estimation methodology for a factor model for high-dimensional matrix-valued time series, where common stochastic trends and common stationary factors can be present. We study, in particular, the estimation of (row and column) loading spaces, of the common stochastic trends and of the common stationary factors, and the row and column ranks thereof. In a set of (negative) preliminary results, we show that a projection-based technique fails to improve the rates of convergence compared to a “flattened” estimation technique which does not take into account the matrix nature of the data. Hence, we develop a three-step algorithm where: (i) we first project the data onto the orthogonal complement to the (row and column) loadings of the common stochastic trends; (ii) we subsequently use such “trend free” data to estimate the stationary common component; (iii) we remove the estimated common stationary component from the data, and re-estimate, using a projection-based estimator, the row and column common stochastic trends and their loadings. We show that this estimator succeeds in refining the rates of convergence of the initial, “flattened” estimator. As a by-product, we develop consistent eigenvalue-ratio based estimators for the number of stationary and nonstationary common factors.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study inference for a Matrix Factor Model (MFM) where common stochastic trends may be present as well as stationary common factors, viz.

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{X}_t = \underset{p_1 \times p_2}{\mathbf{R}_1} \underset{p_1 \times h_{R_1} h_{R_1} \times h_{C_1} h_{C_1} \times p_2}{\mathbf{F}_{1,t}} \underset{h_{C_1} \times p_2}{\mathbf{C}'_1} + \underset{p_1 \times h_{R_0} h_{R_0} \times h_{C_0} h_{C_0} \times p_2}{\mathbf{R}_0} \underset{h_{C_0} \times p_2}{\mathbf{F}_{0,t}} \underset{p_1 \times p_2}{\mathbf{C}'_0} + \underset{p_1 \times p_2}{\mathbf{E}_t},$$

where: $1 \leq t \leq T$, $\min\{p_1, p_2, T\} \rightarrow \infty$, $0 \leq h_{R_1}, h_{C_1}, h_{R_0}, h_{C_0} < \infty$, the common factors $\{\mathbf{F}_{0,t}, -\infty < t < \infty\}$ form a stationary sequence, and the common stochastic trends $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ satisfy

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{F}_{1,t} = \mathbf{F}_{1,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t,$$

with $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, -\infty < t < \infty\}$ a stationary sequence. In particular, we propose a methodology to estimate the row and column loadings spaces for both the stationary and the nonstationary common factor structures (resp. $\mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{C}_0, \mathbf{R}_1$ and \mathbf{C}_1), the common factors $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$, and the dimensions of all factor spaces ($h_{R_1}, h_{C_1}, h_{R_0}$ and h_{C_0}).

Matrix Factor Models: a brief literature review. In recent years, MFMs have been studied extensively as a way of modelling parsimoniously large datasets, and as an alternative to vectorising the data \mathbf{X}_t . [Wang](#)

Acknowledgements We are grateful to the participants to: the Workshop on the Analysis of Complex Data: Tensors, Networks, and Dynamic Systems, (Banff, May 12-17, 2024), in particular Elynn Chen and Qiwei Yao; to the Econometrics with Data Science conference (University of Reading, 16 September, 2024); and to the 1st CAM-Risk conference New risks and policy challenges (Universita' di Pavia, 18-20 December, 2024).

et al. (2019) and Chen and Fan (2023) make powerful cases in favour of exploiting the matrix structure of X_t , when there is a “two-way” factor structure, for the purpose of dimension reduction (see also He et al., 2023). In addition to dimension reduction, several datasets lend themselves naturally to be modelled as matrix-valued time series, with examples in health sciences (such as electronic health records and ICU data) and 2-D image data processing (see, *inter alia*, Chen and Fan, 2023 and Gao et al., 2021), in macroeconomics (see e.g. Wang et al., 2019, where several macroeconomic indicators are modelled for different countries; or Chen et al., 2022, who consider import-export data), and in finance (see e.g. Wang et al., 2019, where several portfolios are modelled through several indicators such as size or BE ratio). There is now a plethora of contributions on inference for *stationary* MFMs. The determination of the number of common factors has been studied in various contributions, including, e.g. Han et al. (2022) and He et al. (2023). The estimation of loadings and common factors has been developed in several articles, including Chen and Fan (2023), who propose an estimation technique based on the spectrum of a weighted average of the mean and the column (row) covariance matrix of the data; Yu et al. (2022), who refine the rates of convergence of the estimated loadings via iterative projections (see also He et al., 2023); and also Chen et al. (2024) and Chen et al. (2022). All the references above, however, consider models where only stationary, $I(0)$ common factors are present, thus ruling out the presence of $I(1)$ common factors as described by equation (1). This can be viewed as an important gap in the literature: many datasets are well-known to be driven by stochastic trends: macroeconomic indicators are typically $I(1)$; and yield curves are often modelled as being driven by common stochastic trends, at least in the vector-valued case (see e.g. Barigozzi and Trapani, 2022, and the empirical application in Hamilton and Xi, 2024). Indeed, not only we are not aware of any contributions dealing with common stochastic trends in the context of matrix-valued time series, but contributions in the context of vector-valued time series that consider $I(1)$ common factors are also rare: Bai (2004) develops the full-blown inferential theory for loadings and common factors; Barigozzi and Trapani (2022) propose a family of randomised tests to determine the number of common trends and stationary factors; and Massacci and Trapani (2022) consider a threshold model where, in each regime, there are latent $I(1)$ common factors. Related contributions, *lato sensu*, have also been developed in the context of high-dimensional cointegration (e.g. Onatski and Wang, 2018, Onatski and Wang, 2019, Bykhovskaya and Gorin, 2022, and Barigozzi et al., 2024). Naturally, in order to estimate (1), it is always possible to take the first difference of the matrix-valued time series \mathbf{X}_t , and apply one of the techniques discussed above for stationary data; however, this would not afford the separate estimation of the $I(1)$ and the $I(0)$ components; in fact, it would not even be possible to understand whether there are any $I(1)$ common factors at all.

In this paper, we fill the aforementioned gap by developing the full-fledged inferential theory for model (1); as we argue below, this is not a mere extension of existing techniques developed for the vector-valued case, as the problem calls for an entirely novel methodology.

The structure of (1). We discuss two possible interpretations of (1)-(2). The first one goes along similar lines as in Wang et al. (2019), and it considers a “two-step” hierarchical factor model. Let the j -th column of \mathbf{X}_t be denoted as $\mathbf{X}_{\cdot j,t}$, $1 \leq j \leq p_2$, and consider the following factor model

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{X}_{\cdot j,t} = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{g}_{j1,t} + \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{g}_{j0,t} + \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\cdot j,t},$$

where $\mathbf{g}_{j1,t}$ is a h_{R_1} -dimensional $I(1)$ process, $\mathbf{g}_{j0,t}$ is a h_{R_0} -dimensional $I(0)$ process, and $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\cdot j,t}$ is an idiosyncratic term; (3) is exactly the same model as in Bai (2004) for a vector-valued time series with common stochastic trends. Define now the $1 \leq i_1 \leq h_{R_1}$ rows of $\mathbf{g}_{j1,t}$ as $\mathbf{g}_{j1,t}^{(i_1)}$, and the $1 \leq i_0 \leq h_{R_0}$ rows of $\mathbf{g}_{j0,t}$ as $\mathbf{g}_{j0,t}^{(i_0)}$, and consider the “nested” factor model for the p_2 -dimensional series $\mathbf{g}_{1,t}^{(i_1)}$, $1 \leq i_1 \leq h_{R_1}$:

$$\mathbf{g}_{1,t}^{(i_1)} = \left(\mathbf{g}_{11,t}^{(i_1)}, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{p_2 1,t}^{(i_1)} \right)' = \underset{p_2 \times h_{C_1}}{\mathbf{C}_1^{(i_1)}} \underset{h_{C_1} \times 1}{\mathbf{h}_{1,i_1,t}} + \underset{h_{C_1} \times 1}{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i_1,t}^{(1)}}$$

where $\mathbf{h}_{1,i_1,t}$ is a vector of $I(1)$ common factors, $\mathbf{C}_1^{(i_1)}$ a loadings matrix, and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i_1,t}^{(1)}$ a p_2 -dimensional stationary idiosyncratic component. By the same token, we also define the nested factor model for the p_2 -dimensional stationary series $\mathbf{g}_{0,t}^{(i_0)}$, $1 \leq i_0 \leq h_{R_0}$:

$$\mathbf{g}_{0,t}^{(i_0)} = \underset{p_2 \times h_{C_0}}{\mathbf{C}_0^{(i_0)}} \underset{h_{C_0} \times 1}{\mathbf{h}_{0,i_0,t}} + \underset{h_{C_0} \times 1}{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i_0,t}^{(0)}}$$

where $\mathbf{h}_{0,i_0,t}$ is a vector of stationary, $I(0)$ common factors. Let us now put the above together. Assume $\mathbf{C}_1^{(i_1)} = \mathbf{C}_1$ and $\mathbf{C}_0^{(i_0)} = \mathbf{C}_0$; define $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ by stacking the vectors $\mathbf{h}'_{1,i_1,t}$, and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$ by stacking the vectors $\mathbf{h}'_{0,i_0,t}$; define $\boldsymbol{\nu}_t^{(1)}$ by stacking the vectors $\boldsymbol{\nu}'_{i_1,t}^{(1)}$, and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_t^{(0)}$ by stacking the vectors $\boldsymbol{\nu}'_{i_0,t}^{(0)}$. We finally receive

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 + \mathbf{R}_1 \boldsymbol{\nu}_t^{(1)} + \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 + \mathbf{R}_0 \boldsymbol{\nu}_t^{(0)} + \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 + \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 + \mathbf{E}_t,$$

where $\mathbf{E}_t \equiv \mathbf{R}_1 \boldsymbol{\nu}_t^{(1)} + \mathbf{R}_0 \boldsymbol{\nu}_t^{(0)} + \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t$.

As a second example, we note that, in (1)-(2), a $p_1 \times p_2$ valued $I(1)$ time series \mathbf{X}_t is driven by a (small) number of common stochastic trends. Hence, (1) represents a case of “two-way” cointegration, in that it is possible to construct vector-valued time series as linear combinations of both the rows and the columns of \mathbf{X}_t which are stationary (in essence, by pre- or post- multiplying \mathbf{X}_t by the orthogonal complements to \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{C}_1 respectively). In this respect, (1) can be viewed, heuristically, as an extension of the common stochastic trends representation of a cointegrated system as discussed in Stock and Watson (1988). Indeed, two recent

contributions (Li and Xiao, 2024, and Hecq et al., 2024) consider the extension of cointegrated Vector AutoRegressions to matrix-valued time series, but only for the case where the cross-sectional dimensions p_1 and p_2 are fixed. As a word of warning, however, we would like to point out that (1) is not entirely aligned to a cointegrated system in the sense of Johansen (1991), and we refer to our concluding remarks in Section 5 for a more thorough analysis.

The estimation methodology. We now offer a preview of how our methodology works and of our results. We begin with an account of the problem at hand; the details are in Section 3.1. Given the number of $I(1)$ common factors h_{R_1} and h_{C_1} , we begin by noting that, when estimating \mathbf{R}_1 using a “flattened” approach based on the second moment matrix $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}_t'$, the estimator has rate $O_P(p_1^{1/2} T^{-1})$ - see Section 3.1.1. Modulo the dimensionality effect represented by the $O_P(p_1^{1/2})$ term, such a “superconsistency” is typical of the estimation of a cointegrated system; however, especially if T is small, this rate may not be sufficiently fast. In order to refine it, a possible, and natural, way of estimating \mathbf{R}_1 in (1) would be to use the iterative projection-based estimator considered in Yu et al. (2022) - that is, given the initial, “flattened” estimator of \mathbf{C}_1 (say $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$), one could define the projected data $\mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$, and re-estimate \mathbf{R}_1 as the eigenvectors corresponding to the h_{R_1} largest eigenvalues of the (suitably rescaled) $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 (\mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1)'$. However, as we show in Section 3.1.2, this estimator fails to improve the rate of convergence of the initial, non-projection-based, estimate of \mathbf{R}_1 . Heuristically, this can be explained by noting that, in (1), the term $\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0$ is present. For the purpose of the projection-based estimator of \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{C}_1 , this is a component of the error term; however, the projection-based estimator essentially works by attenuating the error by averaging it cross-sectionally through its projection onto $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$. Indeed, when \mathbf{X}_t is multiplied by $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$, the “signal” component $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$ contains the term $\mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$, which is proportional to p_2 ; conversely, the error component $\mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$ (provided that the errors are *weakly* cross-sectionally dependent) heuristically becomes proportional to $p_2^{1/2}$ - hence, projecting results in a reduction of the noise-to-signal ratio. However, this argument fails in the presence of stationary common factors: the component $\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$, in general, is proportional to p_2 due to the *strong* cross-sectional dependence induced by the common factors $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$; seeing as this component is effectively part of the error term, the noise-to-signal is not attenuated, and no refinement of the rates of convergence of the estimates of \mathbf{R}_1 (or \mathbf{C}_1) can be expected. In light of the above, it would be desirable to eliminate the $\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0$ component prior to applying the projection method to the estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 (or \mathbf{C}_1). This, too, is not straightforward: a consistent estimate of $\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0$ is required, but this cannot be obtained by simply estimating \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{C}_1 (and the common factors $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$) using the first-stage, flattened estimator mentioned above: the rate of convergence of the estimated $I(1)$ common component $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1$ is not fast enough to be able to get rid of it without an impact on the subsequent estimation of \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 , and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$.

Hence, in this paper we propose a different iterative procedure, which we describe henceforth; the details are in Section 3.2. After obtaining the initial, flattened estimator of \mathbf{C}_1 (resp. \mathbf{R}_1), denoted as $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$, we construct its orthogonal complement $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}$; this is a “huge” matrix, since both the numbers of its rows and columns grow with p_2 . In order to estimate the stationary common component $\mathbf{R}_0\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\mathbf{C}'_0$, we firstly get rid of the $I(1)$ common component $\mathbf{R}_1\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\mathbf{C}'_1$ by projecting the data \mathbf{X}_t onto $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}$, and subsequently using the second moment matrix $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)'$ to estimate \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 , and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$. Interestingly, this approach is the complete opposite to the projection-based estimator (and, in general, to the philosophy of the Johnson-Lindenstrauss Lemma, and of the “sketching” approach, see e.g. [Matoušek, 2008](#) as a comprehensive review): instead of projecting the data onto a small dimensional space which is “parallel” to \mathbf{C}_1 (so as to conserve the information contained in it), we project onto a large dimensional space which is orthogonal (so as to get rid of \mathbf{C}_1). As we show in Section 3.2.1, this procedure yields an estimator of the stationary common component $\mathbf{R}_0\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\mathbf{C}'_0$ (say $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t}\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0$) whose rate of convergence is sufficiently fast to be able to filter it out from the data \mathbf{X}_t . We then construct the “purified” data $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_t = \mathbf{X}_t - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t}\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0$, and apply the projection based estimator thereto, using the second moment matrix $\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{X}}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right)'$. The resulting estimator of \mathbf{R}_1 refines the rate of the initial estimator $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1$, with - in particular - the $O_P\left(p_1^{1/2}T^{-1}\right)$ component in the error term becoming of order $O_P\left(p_1^{1/2}p_2^{-1/2}T^{-1}\right)$. This is exactly what would be expected when using a projection-based estimator in the absence of strong cross-sectional dependence in the error term. In Section 3.2.2, we show that refinements are also available for the corresponding estimator of \mathbf{C}_1 (as can be expected), and for the estimator of the $I(1)$ common factors $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$. As a by-product, we also derive consistent estimation of \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 , and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$. Finally, building on the spectra of the second moment matrices $\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{X}}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right)'$ and $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)'$, we are able to propose estimators of the ranks h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} , h_{R_0} and h_{C_0} based on the eigenvalue ratio principle.

In conclusion, this is the first attempt to carry out inference on a MFM with common stationary and non-stationary, $I(1)$, factors. We make at least three contributions. First, we derive the full-blown estimation theory for the stationary and the non-stationary factor spaces; the “anti-projection” approach which we develop is, to the best of our knowledge, entirely novel. Secondly, we study the estimation of the dimensions of the stationary and the non-stationary factor spaces h_{R_0} , h_{C_0} , h_{R_1} , and h_{C_1} ; whilst this is an application, as mentioned above, of the eigenvalue ratio principle, however this paper is the first contribution to address this issue in the context of MFMs. Thirdly and finally, in the Supplement we study the spectrum of the second moment matrices studied hereafter; building on these, a test for the null hypothesis that the matrix-valued time series \mathbf{X}_t can be readily derived, e.g. building on the randomised tests discussed in [Barigozzi and Trapani \(2022\)](#).

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we discuss our model and the main assumptions required for our methodology. In Section 3, we report the full-fledged inferential theory. In particular, in Section 3.1 we report a set of preliminary, “negative” results concerning the estimation of the $I(1)$ factor structure, and the failure of the iterative projection-based estimator; in Section 3.2 we report the “anti-projection”-based methodology, and the rates of convergence of the estimated non-stationary and stationary factor structures; and in Section 3.3, we propose an estimation technique for the ranks h_{R_0} , h_{C_0} , h_{R_1} , and h_{C_1} . Monte Carlo studies are reported in Section 4. Section 5 concludes, also discussing possible extensions to e.g. the estimation of a cointegrated system. Technical lemmas, proofs and further evidence from synthetic data is contained in the Supplement.

NOTATION. We use $\log(x)$ to denote the natural logarithm of x ; we denote matrices using capitalised bold-face, e.g. \mathbf{A} , their elements using lower-case (e.g. a_{ij} denotes the element of \mathbf{A} in position (i, j)), and, for a generic $n \times m$ matrix \mathbf{A} , we define the space orthogonal to its column space as \mathbf{A}_\perp ; the Frobenius norm is denoted as $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij}^2\right)^{1/2}$. Given a random variable Y , we use $|Y|_\nu$ for its \mathcal{L}_ν -norm, i.e. $|Y|_\nu = (E|Y|^\nu)^{1/\nu}$, $\nu \geq 1$. Other, relevant notation is introduced later on in the paper.

2. MODEL AND ASSUMPTIONS

Recall (1)-(2):

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 + \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 + \mathbf{E}_t,$$

$$\mathbf{F}_{1,t} = \mathbf{F}_{1,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t.$$

In the spirit of *approximate* factor models (Chamberlain and Rothschild, 1983), we assume (weak) serial and cross sectional dependence. As far as the former is concerned, we will rely on the following

Definition. *The d -dimensional sequence $\{m_t, -\infty < t < \infty\}$ forms an \mathcal{L}_ν -decomposable Bernoulli shift if and only if $m_t = h(\eta_t, \eta_{t-1}, \dots)$, where: $\{\eta_t, -\infty < t < \infty\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with values in a measurable space S ; $h(\cdot) : S^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a non random measurable function; $|m_t|_\nu < \infty$; and $|m_t - m_{t,\ell}^*|_\nu \leq c_0 \ell^{-a}$, for some $c_0 > 0$ and $a > 0$, where $m_{t,\ell}^* = h(\eta_t, \dots, \eta_{t-\ell+1}, \eta_{t-\ell,t,\ell}^*, \eta_{t-\ell-1,t,\ell}^*, \dots)$, with $\{\eta_{s,t,\ell}^*, -\infty < s, \ell, t < \infty\}$ i.i.d. copies of η_0 , independent of $\{\eta_t, -\infty < t < \infty\}$.*

The concepts of Bernoulli shift and decomposability appeared first in Ibragimov (1962); see also Wu (2005) and Berkes et al. (2011). Bernoulli shifts have proven a convenient way to model dependent time series, mainly due to their generality and to the fact that they are much easier to verify than e.g. mixing conditions: Aue et al. (2009) and Liu and Lin (2009), *inter alia*, provide numerous examples of such DGPs, which include ARMA models, ARCH/GARCH sequences, and other nonlinear time series models (e.g. random coefficient

autoregressive models and threshold models).

We are now ready to present our assumptions. Prior to doing so, we note that - for the sake of transparency of the proofs - we have tried to write *primitive* assumptions. However, all our assumptions could be replaced by more high-level conditions, as we discuss after each assumption. Recall that the orthogonal complements to \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{C}_1 are denoted as $\mathbf{R}_{1,\perp}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}$ respectively.

Assumption 1. *It holds that: (i) $\{\text{Vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t), -\infty < t < \infty\}$ is an $\mathcal{L}_{2+\delta}$ -decomposable Bernoulli shift with $a > 2$; (ii) (a) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} E \left(T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \right) \left(T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \right)' = \Sigma_F^{(a)}$ with $\Sigma_F^{(a)}$ a positive definite $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ matrix; (b) $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} E \left(T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \right)' \left(T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \right) = \Sigma_F^{(b)}$ with $\Sigma_F^{(b)}$ a positive definite $h_{C_1} \times h_{C_1}$ matrix.*

Assumption 2. *It holds that: (i) $\{\text{Vec}(\mathbf{F}_{0,t}), -\infty < t < \infty\}$ is an \mathcal{L}_4 -decomposable Bernoulli shift with $a > 2$; (ii) (a) $E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}'_{0,t}) = \Sigma_{F,1}^{(a)}$ with $\Sigma_{F,1}^{(a)}$ a positive definite $h_{R_0} \times h_{R_0}$ matrix; (b) $E(\mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t}) = \Sigma_{F,1}^{(b)}$ with $\Sigma_{F,1}^{(b)}$ a positive definite $h_{C_0} \times h_{C_0}$ matrix.*

Assumptions 1 and 2 require $\{\mathbf{F}_{0,t}, -\infty < t < \infty\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, -\infty < t < \infty\}$ to be stationary sequences - hence, whilst *conditional* heteroskedasticity is allowed for, *unconditional* heteroskedasticity is not. In principle, it would be possible to consider this case too, by letting - as suggested in Section 3.2.2 in Horváth and Trapani (2023) - $\{\mathbf{F}_{0,t}, 1 \leq t \leq T\} = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^L \left\{ \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^{(\ell)}, m_{\ell-1} \leq t \leq m_\ell \right\}$ with $m_0 = 1$ and $m_L = T$, assuming that each sequence $\left\{ \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^{(\ell)}, -\infty < t < \infty \right\}$ satisfies Assumption 1. The main reason to have this assumption to model serial dependence is to be able to obtain bounds on the growth rates of partial sums, and other limiting theorems for summations involving $\{\mathbf{F}_{0,t}, -\infty < t < \infty\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, -\infty < t < \infty\}$. As mentioned above, all our technical results could be directly assumed (instead of shown using Assumptions 1 and 2); this would make the set-up more general, but it would be less transparent.

Assumption 3. *It holds that: (i) $E(e_{ij,t}) = 0$ and $E|e_{ij,t}|^4 \leq c_0$ for some $c_0 < \infty$ and all $1 \leq i \leq p_1$ and $1 \leq j \leq p_2$; (ii) (a) $\sum_{t=1}^T |E(e_{ij,t} e_{i'j',s})| \leq c_0$ for all $1 \leq t \neq s \leq T$, $1 \leq i, i' \leq p_1$ and $1 \leq j, j' \leq p_2$; (b) $\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} |E(e_{ij,t} e_{i'j',s})| \leq c_0$ for all $1 \leq t, s \leq T$, $1 \leq i \neq i' \leq p_1$ and $1 \leq j, j' \leq p_2$; (c) $\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{ij,t} e_{i'j',s})| \leq c_0$ for all $1 \leq t, s \leq T$, $1 \leq i, i' \leq p_1$ and $1 \leq j \neq j' \leq p_2$; (d) $\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T |E(e_{hj,t} e_{h'k,s})| \leq c_0$ for all $1 \leq t \neq s \leq T$, $1 \leq h, h' \leq p_1$ and $1 \leq j \neq k \leq p_2$; (e) $\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{hj,t} e_{h'j',t})| \leq c_0$ for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $1 \leq i \neq i' \leq p_1$ and $1 \leq j \neq j' \leq p_2$ (iii) (a) $\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T |\text{Cov}(e_{ik,t} e_{jk,t}, e_{ih,s} e_{jh,s})| \leq c_0$ for all $1 \leq t \neq s \leq T$, $1 \leq i \neq j' \leq p_1$ and $1 \leq h \neq k \leq p_2$.*

Assumption 3 is a standard high-level requirement in this literature: in essence, it allows for the idiosyncratic components to be cross-sectionally correlated, but only weakly, and it is virtually the same as Assumption

D in Yu et al. (2022) and Assumption B3 in He et al. (2023). The only difference with the extant literature is that we require the existence of only 4 moments for the idiosyncratic components (as opposed to 8); this is a direct consequence of Assumption 5 below.

Assumption 4. *It holds that: (i) (a) $\|\mathbf{R}_1\|_{\max} < \infty$ and $\|\mathbf{C}_1\|_{\max} < \infty$; (b) $\|\mathbf{R}_0\|_{\max} < \infty$ and $\|\mathbf{C}_0\|_{\max} < \infty$; (ii) (a) $\mathbf{R}'_0\mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \neq 0$; (b) $\mathbf{C}'_0\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \neq 0$.*

Part (i) of the assumption is standard. As far as part (ii) is concerned, we require it in order to avoid the case where, when anti-projecting onto the orthogonal spaces $\mathbf{R}_{1,\perp}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}$, this annihilates also the common stationary component, as well as the nonstationary one.

Assumption 5. *It holds that: $\{\varepsilon_t, 1 \leq t \leq T\}$, $\{\mathbf{F}_{0,t}, 1 \leq t \leq T\}$ and $\{e_{ij,t}, 1 \leq t \leq T\}$ are three mutually independent groups, for all $1 \leq i \leq p_1$ and $1 \leq j \leq p_2$.*

Assumption 5 is the same as Assumption D in Bai (2004), and in principle it could be relaxed, by replacing some of the assumptions above with more high-level requirements (and strengthening the moment conditions).

3. ESTIMATION

We begin by presenting our “negative” results on the estimation (and of possible refinements thereof) of the row and column loading spaces associated with the common stochastic trends $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$, and on the estimation of $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ itself, in Section 3.1. In Section 3.1.1, we derive, as a benchmark, the results for the flattened estimators; in Section 3.1.2, we show that the rates of convergence cannot be improved by applying the projection-based method directly. In Section 3.2, we present our methodology to refine the rates of convergence: in Section 3.2.1, we estimate the stationary common component after projecting the nonstationary one onto its orthogonal complement, and remove them from the data; in Section 3.2.2, we apply the projection-based methodology to refine the rates of convergence of the row and column loadings associated with the common stochastic trends; and, in Section 3.2.3, we consider a further iteration of this procedure to investigate whether it is possible to refine the estimates of the stationary common component.

3.1. Preliminary theory: negative results on the factor structures estimation. In this section, we report a set of *negative* results, which serve as motivation for our proposed algorithm. In particular, we begin by studying “flattened” estimators of the factor structure corresponding to the $I(1)$ component of equation (1), i.e. estimators based on, essentially, vectorising the matrix-valued series \mathbf{X}_t , in Section 3.1.1. We then consider “projection-based” estimators of the aforementioned factor structure, based on preliminarily projecting the data \mathbf{X}_t onto the space spanned by the columns of \mathbf{C}_1 (or, equivalently, the space spanned by

the rows of \mathbf{R}_1), in Section 3.1.2. In both cases, we show that, owing to the strong cross-sectional dependence induced by the factor structure in the $I(0)$ component of \mathbf{X}_t , estimation results in two major problems: (1) the common $I(1)$ factors cannot be estimated consistently (not even after a linear transformation), thus also making it impossible to estimate consistently the common $I(1)$ component $\mathbf{R}_1\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\mathbf{C}'_1$, in turn making it impossible to estimate the $I(0)$ common factor structure; and (2) even though the spaces spanned by the columns of \mathbf{C}_1 or \mathbf{R}_1 can be estimated consistently, projecting onto \mathbf{C}_1 or \mathbf{R}_1 does not improve the rates of convergence of such estimators.

3.1.1. *The flattened estimators.* Consider the “flattened” sample covariance matrices

$$(4) \quad \mathbf{M}_{R_1} = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}'_t, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{M}_{C_1} = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}'_t \mathbf{X}_t.$$

The estimator of \mathbf{R}_1 (\mathbf{C}_1) is defined as the eigenvectors corresponding to the largest h_{R_1} (resp. h_{C_1}) eigenvalues of M_{R_1} (resp. \mathbf{M}_{C_1}), viz.

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{M}_{R_1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 = \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{M}_{C_1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1},$$

where Λ_{R_1} is a $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ diagonal matrix containing the largest h_{R_1} eigenvalues of \mathbf{M}_{R_1} , and Λ_{C_1} is defined similarly, under the constraints $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 = p_1 \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 = p_2 \mathbf{I}_{h_{C_1}}$.

Theorem 1. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exist: a $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ matrix \mathbf{H}_{R_1} , with $\|\mathbf{H}_{R_1}\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\|(\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1}\|_F = O_P(1)$; and a $h_{C_1} \times h_{C_1}$ matrix \mathbf{H}_{C_1} , with $\|\mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\|(\mathbf{H}_{C_1})^{-1}\|_F = O_P(1)$, such that*

$$\left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{T} \right).$$

The results in Theorem 1 are “standard”: the $O_P(T^{-1})$ rate is a consequence of having cointegration, and it corresponds to the well-known notion of “superconsistency” in time series econometrics (Stock, 1987); the main difference, in our context, is the lack of identification which is typical of factor models, so that $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$ are only able to estimate a transformation of \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{C}_1 respectively. The impact of the dimensionality (given by the terms $p_1^{1/2}$ and $p_2^{1/2}$ respectively) is also a standard feature of high dimensional factor models: e.g., a similar result is found in Bai (2004) in the context of vector-valued time series.

As we show in Lemma 1 below, the rates in Theorem 1 are generally not enough to estimate consistently the space spanned by the common nonstationary factors $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$. We consider the following, Least-Squares-based,

estimator

$$(6) \quad \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t} = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1.$$

Lemma 1. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that $\|\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_1})^{-1}\|_F = O_P(1)$.*

Lemma 1 does state that $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t}$ is consistent: the estimation error is of order $O_P(1)$, which is of a smaller order of magnitude than the signal $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ - a standard application of the Functional Central Limit Theorem yields $\|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F = O_P(T^{1/2})$. However, the rate of convergence is slower than e.g. the one derived in Theorem 2 in Bai (2004), where it is shown that - for an N -dimensional vector-valued time series - the rate of convergence is found to be $O_P(N^{-1/2}) + O_P(T^{-3/2}) = o_P(1)$.

In the case of Lemma 1, the $O_P(1)$ order arises from the fact that, in (1), the remainder \mathbf{U}_t defined as

$$(7) \quad \mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 + \mathbf{U}_t = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{C}'_1 + (\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 + \mathbf{E}_t),$$

also contains a factor structure. In turn, upon inspecting the proof of Lemma 1 (and comparing it with e.g. the proof of Theorem 2 in Bai, 2004), when applying cross-sectional averaging to \mathbf{U}_t , the strong cross-correlation arising from the presence of $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$ prevents it from drifting to zero. Intuitively, this indicates that, as can be expected, cross-sectional averaging does not help in the presence of common factors.

3.1.2. *Projection-based estimation.* We now show that the same problems as in Lemma 1 affects the projection-based estimators of \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{C}_1 . These could be constructed along the lines studied in He et al. (2023), *inter alia*, using

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}^\dagger = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{X}_t', \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}^\dagger = \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_t' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{X}_t,$$

as the eigenvectors corresponding to the largest h_{R_1} (resp. h_{C_1}) eigenvalues of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}^\dagger$ (resp. $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}^\dagger$), viz.

$$(8) \quad \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger = \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1^\dagger = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1^\dagger \Lambda_{C_1}^\dagger,$$

where $\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger$ is a $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ diagonal matrix containing the largest h_{R_1} eigenvalues of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}^\dagger$, and $\Lambda_{C_1}^\dagger$ is defined similarly, under the constraints $(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger = p_1 \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}}$ and $(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1^\dagger)' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1^\dagger = p_2 \mathbf{I}_{h_{C_1}}$.

Lemma 2. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exists a $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ matrix $\mathbf{H}_{R_1}^\dagger$, with $\|\mathbf{H}_{R_1}^\dagger\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\left\| \left(\mathbf{H}_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P(1)$, and a $h_{C_1} \times h_{C_1}$ matrix $\mathbf{H}_{C_1}^\dagger$, with $\|\mathbf{H}_{C_1}^\dagger\|_F = O_P(1)$ and*

$$\left\| \left(\mathbf{H}_{C_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P(1), \text{ such that}$$

$$\left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1}^\dagger \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1^\dagger - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}^\dagger \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{T} \right).$$

Lemma 2 is, in essence, a negative result: despite projecting \mathbf{X}_t onto the space spanned by the columns of \mathbf{C}_1 , the rate of convergence of the new estimator $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger$ does not improve over that of $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1$. Intuitively, this is due to the fact that, when projecting \mathbf{X}_t onto \mathbf{C}_1 , the effect on the “signal” component $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{C}_1$ is to make it grow by a factor $\mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{C}_1 \sim p_2$; on the other hand, the effect of such projecting on \mathbf{U}_t in (7) depends on the extent of cross-sectional dependence in \mathbf{U}_t . If the columns of \mathbf{U}_t are weakly cross-correlated, the effect of projecting is that $\mathbf{U}_t \mathbf{C}_1$ will grow at a rate $O(p_2^{1/2})$; in such a case, with the signal growing as p_2 , the signal-to-noise ratio would be enhanced, thereby resulting in an estimate with a faster rate of convergence. Conversely, in the presence of strong dependence among the columns of \mathbf{U}_t , the cross-sectional averaging in $\mathbf{U}_t \mathbf{C}_1$ will result in a rate proportional to p_2 ; in this case, the signal and the noise would grow by the same factor, hence resulting in no enhancement of the rates of convergence of the projection-based estimator.

3.2. Inferential theory based on anti-projections. The (negative) results in Lemmas 1 and 2 suggest that, in order to enhance the rates of convergence of the estimated common factors and loadings, the stationary common factor structure needs to be filtered out first, and then a projection-based technique can be applied. Hence, in this section, we present the three stages of our algorithms and the corresponding theory. First, we propose an estimator of \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$, obtained after projecting away the $I(1)$ component onto the space orthogonal to the columns of \mathbf{C}_1 or, equivalently, \mathbf{R}_1 (Section 3.2.1); the output is a set of consistent (modulo a linear transformation) estimators of \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$, and therefore of the common $I(0)$ component $\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}_0'$ - albeit with improvable rates of convergence. Second, we study the estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{C}_1 and $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$, after subtracting the estimated common $I(0)$ component $\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}_0'$ from the data \mathbf{X}_t , and projecting these onto the space spanned by (the estimated) \mathbf{C}_1 or equivalently \mathbf{R}_1 , thus taking advantage of the fact that, after removing the common $I(0)$ component from the data, cross-sectional dependence becomes substantially weaker (Section 3.2.2); the output is a set of consistent (modulo a linear transformation) estimators of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{C}_1 and $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$, and therefore of the common $I(1)$ component $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}_1'$ - with faster rates of convergence than the ones derived in Section 3.1.1 for \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{C}_1 . Third, we refine the rates of convergence obtained in the first step, by projecting the data \mathbf{X}_t (minus the estimated common $I(1)$ component $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}_1'$) onto the space spanned by (the estimated) \mathbf{C}_0 or equivalently \mathbf{R}_0 (Section 3.2.3); the output is a set of consistent (modulo a linear transformation) estimators of \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$, and therefore

of the common $I(0)$ component $\mathbf{R}_0\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\mathbf{C}'_0$, with faster rates of convergence than the ones derived in the first step.

3.2.1. *Anti-projection based estimation of \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$.* Define the orthogonal (to the columns of \mathbf{C}_1) space and its corresponding sample version

$$(9) \quad \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} = \mathbf{I}_{p_2} - \mathbf{C}_1 (\mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{C}'_1,$$

$$(10) \quad \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} = \mathbf{I}_{p_2} - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1.$$

The two matrices are: $p_2 \times p_2$; symmetric; and idempotent. By the same token, we can also define $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}$ (as an estimator of the space $\mathbf{R}_{1,\perp}$, orthogonal to the columns of \mathbf{R}), and study its use and its properties; Define

$$(11) \quad \hat{\mathbf{X}}_t^{C_1} = \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{X}}_t^{R_1} = \mathbf{X}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp},$$

$$(12) \quad \mathbf{M}_{R_1,\perp} = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{X}}_t^{C_1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_t^{C_1} \right)', \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{M}_{C_1,\perp} = \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{X}}_t^{R_1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{X}}_t^{R_1} \right)'.$$

The estimator of \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{C}_0) is defined as the eigenvectors corresponding to the largest h_{R_1} (resp. h_{C_1}) eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}_{R_1,\perp}$ (resp. $\mathbf{M}_{C_1,\perp}$), viz.

$$(13) \quad \mathbf{M}_{R_1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 = \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{M}_{C_1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0},$$

where Λ_{R_0} is a $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ diagonal matrix containing the largest h_{R_1} eigenvalues of $\mathbf{M}_{R_1,\perp}$, and Λ_{C_0} is defined similarly, under the constraints $\hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 = p_1 \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 = p_2 \mathbf{I}_{h_{C_1}}$.

Theorem 2. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exist: a $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ matrix \mathbf{H}_{R_0} , with $\|\mathbf{H}_{R_0}\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\|(\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1}\|_F = O_P(1)$; and a $h_{C_1} \times h_{C_1}$ matrix \mathbf{H}_{C_0} , with $\|\mathbf{H}_{C_0}\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\|(\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1}\|_F = O_P(1)$, such that*

$$(14) \quad \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2} \right),$$

$$(15) \quad \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2} \right).$$

Equations (14) and (15) contain the rates of convergence of $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0$; again, \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{C}_0 are estimated modulo a transformation. The estimators $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0$ are, in essence, projection-based estimators; hence, their rates can be compared with the ones obtained e.g. in Theorem 3.1 in He et al. (2023). The two terms in (14) and (15) are the same as found in He et al. (2023); we would like to point out that He et al. (2023)

obtain also further error terms, which in our case are absent. This is, essentially, due to the fact that the projection matrix, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}$, has a very fast rate of convergence to $\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}$,¹ with $\left\|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\right\|_F^2 = O_P(T^{-2})$. We now turn to the estimation of the stationary common factors $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$. Using the Least Squares principle, we can define the following estimator of $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$

$$(16) \quad \text{Vec } \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} = \left[\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right)^{-1} \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right)^{-1} \right] \\ \times \left[\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right) \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \right) \right] \text{Vec } \mathbf{X}_t.$$

Let for short $p_{1\wedge 2} = \min\{p_1, p_2\}$.

Theorem 3. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then*

$$(17) \quad \left\| \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_{1\wedge 2} T}\right),$$

where \mathbf{H}_{R_0} and \mathbf{H}_{C_0} are defined in Theorem 2, and

$$(18) \quad \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right\|_F^2 = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{(p_{1\wedge 2} T)^2}\right).$$

Theorem 3 states the consistency of the estimate of the space spanned by the common stationary factors. The rates in the theorem can be compared with Theorem 3.5(1) in He et al. (2023): the $O_P\left((p_1 p_2)^{-1/2}\right)$ component is the same as in our case, and it can be viewed as a non-improvable component of the estimator. Conversely, in He et al. (2023) the $O_P\left((p_{1\wedge 2} T)^{-1}\right)$ component is replaced by an $O_P\left((p_{1\wedge 2} T^{1/2})^{-1}\right)$ term. In our case, this difference arises from using $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}$.

3.2.2. *Projected estimation of \mathbf{C}_1 , \mathbf{R}_1 and $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$.* Consider now the “filtered” data

$$(19) \quad \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}_t = \mathbf{X}_t - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0',$$

and the corresponding projected covariance matrix

$$\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{X}}_t'.$$

Letting $\tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}$ be a $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ diagonal matrix containing the largest h_{R_1} eigenvalues of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}$, we can define the estimator of \mathbf{R}_1 as the solution to the eigenvalue/eigenvector problem

$$(20) \quad \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}.$$

¹See Lemmas 17 and 18.

We can define, analogously

$$\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1} = \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathring{\mathbf{X}}_t' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathring{\mathbf{X}}_t,$$

and subsequently obtain the projected estimator of \mathbf{C}_1 as the solution of

$$(21) \quad \mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1},$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}$ is defined, similarly to $\tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}$, as a $h_{C_1} \times h_{C_1}$ diagonal matrix containing the largest h_{R_1} eigenvalues of $\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}$.

Theorem 4. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exist: a $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}$, with $\|\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\left\| \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P(1)$; and a $h_{C_1} \times h_{C_1}$ matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}$, with $\|\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\left\| \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P(1)$, such that*

$$(22) \quad \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T^2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \right),$$

$$(23) \quad \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2} T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{T^2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \right).$$

Using the Least Squares principle, we can propose the following estimator of $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$

$$(24) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t} = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathring{\mathbf{X}}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1.$$

Let $\tilde{\zeta}_1 = \min \left\{ p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2}, p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}, T^{3/2} \right\}$.

Theorem 5. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then*

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t} - \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}' \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\tilde{\zeta}_1^{-1} \right),$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}$ are defined in Theorem 4, and

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t} - \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}' \right)^{-1} \right\|_F^2 = O_P \left(\tilde{\zeta}_1^{-2} \right).$$

3.2.3. Projected estimation of \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$. Finally, it is possible to iterate the ‘‘anti-projection’’ approach to re-estimate \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$. Define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^{C_1} = \mathbf{X}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}^s, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^{R_1} = \mathbf{X}_t' \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}^s,$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1,\perp} = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^{C_1} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^{C_1} \right)', \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1,\perp} = \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^{R_1} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t^{R_1} \right)'.$$

The estimator of \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{C}_0) is defined as the eigenvectors corresponding to the largest h_{R_0} (resp. h_{C_0}) eigenvalues of $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1,\perp}$ (resp. $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1,\perp}$), viz.

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1,\perp}\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 = \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_0\widetilde{\Lambda}_{R_0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1,\perp}\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_0 = \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_0\widetilde{\Lambda}_{C_0}.$$

where $\widetilde{\Lambda}_{R_0}$ is a $h_{R_0} \times h_{R_0}$ diagonal matrix containing the largest h_{R_0} eigenvalues of $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1,\perp}$, and $\widetilde{\Lambda}_{C_0}$ is defined similarly, under the constraints $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_0'\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 = p_1\mathbf{I}_{h_{R_0}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_0'\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_0 = p_2\mathbf{I}_{h_{C_0}}$.

The next lemma shows that $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_0$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_0$ do not improve with respect to $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_0$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_0$ (at least, as far as the dominating terms are concerned).

Lemma 3. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 hold. Then there exist a $h_{R_0} \times h_{R_0}$ matrix $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0}$, with $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0}\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\left\|\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0}\right)^{-1}\right\|_F$, and a $h_{C_0} \times h_{C_0}$ matrix $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0}$, with $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0}\|_F = O_P(1)$ and $\left\|\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0}\right)^{-1}\right\|_F$ such that*

$$(25) \quad \left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0}\right\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2}T^{1/2}}\right),$$

$$(26) \quad \left\|\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0}\right\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2}T^{1/2}}\right).$$

It is however possible to refine the rates of the estimated stationary common factors $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$. These are defined as

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Vec } \widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} &= \left[\left(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}^s \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}^s \right)' \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right)^{-1} \otimes \left(\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_0' \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}^s \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}^s \right)' \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right)^{-1} \right] \\ &\quad \times \left[\left(\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}^s \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{R}}_0' \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}^s \right) \left(\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}^s \right)' \otimes \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}^s \right)' \right) \right] \text{Vec } \mathbf{X}_t. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we are using $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_0$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_0$; in principle, it is possible to also use $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_0$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_0$, but the results in Lemma 3 cast doubts over the effectiveness of such a choice. Let $\widetilde{\zeta}_0 = \min \left\{ p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2}, p_{1\wedge 2} T^2, p_{1\wedge 2}^2 T, p_{1\wedge 2}^{3/2} T^{3/2} \right\}$.

Theorem 6. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then*

$$\left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0}' \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\widetilde{\zeta}_0^{-1} \right),$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0}$ are defined in Lemma 3, and

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0}' \right)^{-1} \right\|_F^2 = O_P \left(\widetilde{\zeta}_0^{-2} \right).$$

The rates can be compared with those in Theorem 3: the non-improvable rate $O_P \left((p_1 p_2)^{-1/2} \right)$ is still present; however, the estimator-dependent rate has been refined.

3.3. Estimation of the number of common factors. In the above, we have (implicitly) assumed that the number of common stationary and nonstationary factors h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} , h_{R_0} , and h_{C_0} are known. In practice, this is seldom the case, and an estimate of h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} , h_{R_0} , and h_{C_0} is required as the preliminary step in order to use our methodology. In this section, we discuss this issue, proposing a family of consistent estimators for the numbers of common factors.

Our first result shows that, as long as h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} , h_{R_0} , and h_{C_0} are estimated consistently, all the theory derived above still holds. Let \check{h}_{R_1} , \check{h}_{C_1} , \check{h}_{R_0} , and \check{h}_{C_0} denote such estimators.

Lemma 4. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then, if $\check{h}_{R_1} = h_{R_1} + o_P(1)$, $\check{h}_{C_1} = h_{C_1} + o_P(1)$, $\check{h}_{R_0} = h_{R_0} + o_P(1)$, and $\check{h}_{C_0} = h_{C_0} + o_P(1)$, Theorems 1-5, and Lemmas 1-3 still hold.*

Several possible estimators can be proposed for h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} , h_{R_0} , and h_{C_0} : our results in Lemmas 12, 13, 19, 20, 25 and 26 lend themselves to extending, to the matrix-valued time series context, both the information criteria proposed in Bai (2004) and the sequential randomised tests proposed in Barigozzi and Trapani (2022). Other methodologies, specifically developed for the case of stationary matrix- or tensor-valued time series, could be also extended to our context - whilst an exhaustive treatment goes beyond the scope of this section, we refer to the article by He et al. (2023) for a comprehensive review of the state of the art on this important issue. Here, we propose a methodology based on the eigenvalue ratio (ER) principle (see Lam and Yao, 2012, and Ahn and Horenstein, 2013). We introduce the following estimators for h_{R_1} and h_{C_1} :

$$(28) \quad \hat{h}_{R_1} = \arg \max_{0 \leq j \leq h_{\max}} \frac{\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{R_1})}{\lambda_{j+1}(\mathbf{M}_{R_1}) + \hat{c}_{R_1} \delta_{R_1, p_1, p_2, T}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{h}_{C_1} = \arg \max_{0 \leq j \leq h_{\max}} \frac{\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{C_1})}{\lambda_{j+1}(\mathbf{M}_{C_1}) + \hat{c}_{C_1} \delta_{C_1, p_1, p_2, T}},$$

which are based on the “flattened” covariance matrices \mathbf{M}_{R_1} and \mathbf{M}_{C_1} respectively - an alternative to \hat{h}_{R_1} and \hat{h}_{C_1} can also be based on the eigenvalues of $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}^\dagger$ and $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}^\dagger$ respectively, and in this case we use the notation $\hat{h}_{R_1}^\dagger$ and $\hat{h}_{C_1}^\dagger$; and

$$(29) \quad \tilde{h}_{R_1} = \arg \max_{0 \leq j \leq h_{\max}} \frac{\lambda_j(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1})}{\lambda_{j+1}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}) + \tilde{c}_{R_1} \delta_{R_1 \diamond, p_1, p_2, T}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}_{C_1} = \arg \max_{0 \leq j \leq h_{\max}} \frac{\lambda_j(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1})}{\lambda_{j+1}(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}) + \tilde{c}_{C_1} \delta_{C_1 \diamond, p_1, p_2, T}},$$

which are based on the projected covariance matrices $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}$ and $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}$ respectively. It can be envisaged that, given that the eigen-gap is wider in the case of $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}$ and $\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}$ as opposed to \mathbf{M}_{R_1} and \mathbf{M}_{C_1} (and $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}^\dagger$ and $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}^\dagger$), \tilde{h}_{R_1} and \tilde{h}_{C_1} may offer a better performance than \hat{h}_{R_1} and \hat{h}_{C_1} (and $\hat{h}_{R_1}^\dagger$ and $\hat{h}_{C_1}^\dagger$); we explore this in simulations. In both (28) and (29), the “mock” eigenvalues $\lambda_0(\cdot)$ are designed to as to pick up the case of no common factor; following Ahn and Horenstein (2013), we construct these as $\lambda_0(\mathbf{M}_l) = \omega_{p_1, p_2, T}^\iota$, with $\iota \in \{R_1, C_1, R_1 \diamond, C_1 \diamond\}$, with the convention that $\mathbf{M}_{R_1 \diamond} = \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}$, $\mathbf{M}_{C_1 \diamond} = \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1}$, and $\omega_{p_1, p_2, T}^\iota$ is a sequence such that, as $\min\{p_1, p_2, T\} \rightarrow \infty$, $\omega_{p_1, p_2, T}^\iota \rightarrow 0$ and $(\delta_{l, p_1, p_2, T})^{-1} \omega_{p_1, p_2, T}^\iota \rightarrow \infty$. Further, in both (28)

and (29), h_{\max} is a user-chosen upper bound such that $h_{\max} < \min\{p_1, p_2, T\}$, and we use the following sequences

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{R_1, p_1, p_2, T} &= \delta_{C_1, p_1, p_2, T} = \frac{1}{T}, \\ \delta_{R_1 \diamond, p_1, p_2, T} &= \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{p_2 T} + \frac{1}{T^2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T}, \\ \delta_{C_1 \diamond, p_1, p_2, T} &= \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{p_1 T} + \frac{1}{T^2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we propose the following estimators for h_{R_0} and h_{C_0} :

$$(30) \quad \hat{h}_{R_0} = \arg \max_{0 \leq j \leq h_{\max}} \frac{\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{R_1, \perp})}{\lambda_{j+1}(\mathbf{M}_{R_1, \perp}) + c_{R_0} \delta_{R_0, p_1, p_2, T}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{h}_{C_0} = \arg \max_{0 \leq j \leq h_{\max}} \frac{\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{C_1, \perp})}{\lambda_{j+1}(\mathbf{M}_{C_1, \perp}) + c_{C_0} \delta_{C_0, p_1, p_2, T}},$$

which are based on the ‘‘anti-projected’’ covariance matrices $\mathbf{M}_{R_1, \perp}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{C_1, \perp}$. Even in this case, h_{\max} is a user-chosen upper bound such that $h_{\max} < \min\{p_1, p_2, T\}$, and

$$\delta_{R_0, p_1, p_2, T} = \frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{C_0, p_1, p_2, T} = \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2}.$$

As above, the mock eigenvalues are defined as $\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{\iota, \perp}) = \omega_{p_1, p_2, T}^{\iota}$, with, as $\min\{p_1, p_2, T\} \rightarrow \infty$, $\omega_{p_1, p_2, T}^{\iota} \rightarrow 0$, and $(\delta_{\iota, p_1, p_2, T})^{-1} \omega_{p_1, p_2, T}^{\iota} \rightarrow \infty$, for $\iota \in \{(R_0), (C_0)\}$. The constants \hat{c}_{R_1} , \hat{c}_{C_1} , \tilde{c}_{R_1} , \tilde{c}_{C_1} , c_{R_0} and c_{C_0} can e.g. be chosen adaptively, using different subsamples and choosing the values of the constants which offer stable estimates across such subsamples, in a similar spirit to Hallin and Liška (2007) and Alessi et al. (2010).

Theorem 7. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then, as $\min\{p_1, p_2, T\} \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that all the estimators defined in (28), (29) and (30) are consistent - i.e., $\hat{h}_{R_1} = h_{R_1} + o_P(1)$, and so on.*

4. MONTE CARLO EVIDENCE

In this Section we show the results of a series of Monte Carlo studies to showcase the performance of our methodology. Section 4.1 contains some key results for the estimators of the factor loadings and a comparison of their convergence rates; Section 4.2 is devoted to the estimation of the number of factors. The full set of detailed results can be found in Appendix C.

We simulate from the following Data Generating Process (DGP)

$$(31) \quad \mathbf{X}_t = \underbrace{\mathbf{R}_1}_{p_1 \times p_2} \underbrace{\mathbf{F}_{1,t}}_{p_1 \times h_{R_1}} \underbrace{\mathbf{C}'_1}_{h_{R_1} \times h_{C_1}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{R}_0}_{p_1 \times h_{R_0}} \underbrace{\mathbf{F}_{0,t}}_{h_{R_0} \times h_{C_0}} \underbrace{\mathbf{C}'_0}_{h_{C_0} \times p_2} + \mathbf{E}_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T$$

where:

- $\mathbf{F}_{1,t} = \mathbf{F}_{1,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ with $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1} h_{C_1}})$;
- $\text{Vec}(\mathbf{F}_{0,t}) \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_0 \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_0} h_{C_0}})$;

Case	h_{R_0}	h_{C_0}	h_{R_1}	h_{C_1}	a_0	a_1	σ_0
1.1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
2.1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
2.2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2
3.1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
3.2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
4.1	1	1	1	1	10	10	1
4.2	1	1	1	1	10	10	2

TABLE 4.1. Parameters' combination for the simulation study on the rates of convergence.

- $\mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{C}_0 \sim \mathcal{U}[-a_0, a_0]$, $\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{C}_1 \sim \mathcal{U}[-a_1, a_1]$

4.1. Estimation and convergence rates. We explore the cases presented in Table 4.1, and we combine them with, with $p_1 = 10, 20, 50, 100$, $p_2 = 20$, $T = 20, 50, 100, 200$. For each parameters' combination we consider the average over 1000 Monte Carlo replications. Due to identification indeterminacy, we measure the performance of the estimators using the distance between subspaces. Given two orthogonal matrices O_1 and O_2 of sizes $p \times q_1$ and $p \times q_2$, define

$$(32) \quad \mathcal{D}(O_1, O_2) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\max(q_1, q_2)} \text{tr}(O_1 O_1' O_2 O_2') \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

$\mathcal{D}(O_1, O_2)$ ranges between 0 and 1. It is equal to 0 if the column spaces of O_1 and O_2 are the same, and 1 if they are orthogonal.

Figure 4.1 shows the boxplots of the ratio $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flat}}/\mathcal{D}_{\text{proj}}$ between the initial flattened and the refined projected estimators for \mathbf{R}_1 (left) and \mathbf{C}_1 (right) against series' length T . Each boxplot contains 32 values for a specific T , corresponding to the 8 cases (1.1 - 4.2) times the 4 values of p_1 . In turn, each of the 32 values is the average over 1000 Monte Carlo replications. Clearly, the refined projected estimator improves uniformly over the initial "flattened" estimator and the gain increases with the length of the series, reaching a median ratio of about 2.4 for $T = 200$. The ratio reaches 3.2 in some instances. The boxplots of the ratio $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flat}}/\mathcal{D}_{\text{proj}}$ against row-dimension p_1 is reported in Figure C.1 in Appendix C and the results are also consistent with the theoretical convergence rates in that, for fixed p_2 and T , as p_1 increases, the ratio should decrease for \mathbf{R}_1 and increase for \mathbf{C}_1 . A different, non trivial, behaviour is expected for \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{C}_0 since the theoretical convergence rates of the initial and refined estimators are the same, see Figure 4.2 where the boxplots of the ratio are plotted against p_1 . The plot against T can be found in Figure C.2 of the Appendix. In any case, also in this instance, the refined estimators improve uniformly over the initial ones, albeit by a tighter margin with respect to those for \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{C}_1 .




FIGURE 4.1. Boxplots of the ratio $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flat}}/\mathcal{D}_{\text{proj}}$ between the initial flattened and the refined projected estimators for $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1$ (left) and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1$ (right) against series' length T .




FIGURE 4.2. Boxplots of the ratio $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flat}}/\mathcal{D}_{\text{proj}}$ between the initial flattened and the refined projected estimators for $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0$ (left) and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0$ (right) against p_1 .

The detailed results for Case 1.1 are shown in Figure 4.3, where the distances $\mathcal{D}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1, \mathbf{R}_1)$ (left) and $\mathcal{D}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1, \mathbf{C}_1)$ (right) are plotted against the length of the series T for different values of the row-dimension p_1 . Clearly, the refined projected estimator (circles) is always superior to the initial “flattened” estimator (triangles) and the rate also depends on p_1 . This latter finding can also be appreciated from Figure 4.4, which shows the results of the estimation of \mathbf{R}_0 (left) and \mathbf{C}_0 (right). The full set of detailed results can be found in the Appendix C.

4.2. **Estimating the number of factors.** We simulate from the DGP of Eq. (31), with

- $\mathbf{F}_{1,t} = \mathbf{F}_{1,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ with $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1} h_{C_1}})$;
- $\text{Vec}(\mathbf{F}_{0,t}) \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_0} h_{C_0}})$;




FIGURE 4.3. Case 1.1: estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 (left) and \mathbf{C}_1 (right) for varying series length T and row dimension p_1 . Also, $p_2 = 20$, whereas $\mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{C}_0 \sim \mathcal{U}[-1, 1]$, $\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{C}_1 \sim \mathcal{U}[-1, 1]$. Triangles with dashed lines indicate the initial “flattened” estimator, circles with full lines indicate the refined projected estimator.




FIGURE 4.4. Case 1.1: as Figure 4.3 but for \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{C}_0 .

- $\mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{C}_0 \sim \mathcal{U}[-1, 1]$, $\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{C}_1 \sim \mathcal{U}[-1, 1]$

We explore the following cases

Case	h_{R_0}	h_{C_0}	h_{R_1}	h_{C_1}
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	1	1	2	2
4	1	1	3	3
5	2	2	1	1
6	3	3	1	1
7	2	1	1	1
8	1	1	2	1

and, as in the previous section, we combine the above with $p_1 = 10, 20, 50, 100$, $p_2 = 20$, $T = 20, 50, 100, 200$. We focus on the frequency of correct identification of h_{R_0} , h_{C_0} , h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} , based upon 1000 Monte Carlo replications. Here we report the results of different implementations of the Eigenvalue Ratio criterion:

static: : h_{R_0} , h_{C_0} , h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} are estimated once in the procedure.

it0: starts from the above static estimates. Then, it uses the estimated number of $I(1)$ factors as starting values for the procedure, which stops when either the final estimated numbers of $I(1)$ factors coincide with the initial ones, or the maximum number of iterations is reached.

it1: starts from the **it0** estimates. If the initial estimate is not a fixed point i.e. the initial and refined estimates of the $I(1)$ parameters are the same at the first iteration, then, tries to refine as follows.

- (1) computes the static estimates on a grid of initial values for h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} ;
- (2) derives the graph of the combinations from the grid and retains the fixed point of the graph as candidates;
- (3) if there is at least one candidate, updates the initial **it0** estimates if either the max number of iterations is reached or there is a new candidate/parameter combination with max average ER value and max cluster size.

it2: starts from the **it0** estimates and keeps the values of h_{R_0} , h_{C_0} . If the initial estimate is not a fixed point i.e. the initial and refined estimates of the $I(1)$ parameters are the same at the first iteration, then, tries to refine the $I(1)$ parameters as follows.

- (1) computes the static estimates on a grid of initial values for h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} .
- (2) derives the graph of the combinations from the grid and retains the fixed point of the graph as candidates.
- (3) if there is at least one candidate, updates the initial **it0** estimates by choosing the values of h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} individually as the maximizers of the ER value among the parameters' combinations.

In practice, criteria **it1** and **it2** differ only in step (3) when it comes to updating the initial estimates based upon **it0**. To showcase the advantages of refined iterative procedures over the simple iterative estimator **it0** we simulate a series from with the following parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{R_0} = 1; \quad h_{C_0} = 1; \quad h_{R_1} = 2; \quad h_{C_1} = 1; \quad (\text{case 8}) \\ p_1 = 100; \quad p_2 = 20; \quad T = 50; \end{aligned}$$

Both the static and the simple iterative estimators for the number of factors incorrectly estimate $h_{R_0} = h_{C_0} = h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$. The reason for this can be appreciated in Figure 4.5 where we show the associated graph where the nodes are the grid of initial values for h_{R_1} , h_{C_1} and the arrows show the node connecting the




FIGURE 4.6. Boxplots of the percentages of correct estimation of the number of factors for the 4 criteria for different parameters. Each boxplot contains 128 percentages: 8 cases \times 4 values for $p_1 \times$ 4 values for T . The extended results, stratified by p_1 and T are available in Figure C.10 of the Appendix C.




FIGURE 4.7. Boxplots of the differences of percentages of correct estimation of the number of factors for the iterative criteria w.r.t. the static criterion. Positive values indicate that the iterative version is superior w.r.t. the static one. Each boxplot contains 128 percentages: 8 cases \times 4 values for $p_1 \times$ 4 values for T . The extended results, stratified by p_1 and T are available in Figure C.11 of the Appendix C.

shows a consistent gain for R_1 and C_1 , so that it remains our recommended choice to date. As above, the extended results, stratified by p_1 and T are available in Figure C.11 of the Appendix C.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we study inference in the context of a factor model for a high-dimensional matrix-valued time series with the possible presence of common stochastic trends and common stationary factors. The inferential problem is not a simple extension of existing techniques: the presence of the common stationary factors makes it impossible to refine the rates of the estimators of the non-stationary common factor structure using e.g. the iterated projection-based estimator of Yu et al. (2022). Hence, we propose an entirely novel procedure, based on a preliminary step where the common stochastic trends are eliminated by projecting them away onto a large dimensional space constructed as the orthogonal complement to the loadings space of the $I(1)$ common factor structure. As mentioned in the introduction, this step goes in the opposite direction to the projection-based estimator, and we view it as an “anti-projection” (or an “anti-Johnson-Lindenstrauss”)

argument. After getting rid of the common $I(1)$ components, we estimate the common stationary component in a standard way, and after removing it from the data, we are able to use the full force of the iterative projection-based estimator. Our results, in terms of the rates of convergence of the estimated loadings and common factors, show that we are able to refine the rates of convergence of the estimators of the $I(1)$ factor structure. As a by-product, we also propose a technique to estimate the number of common factors in both the $I(1)$ and the stationary structures; further, building on the results on the spectrum of the second moment matrices studied in this paper, it would also be possible to propose several tests, along e.g. the lines of [Barigozzi and Trapani \(2022\)](#), for the null hypothesis that the data are $I(1)$, which would serve as a preliminary step to ascertain whether our estimation technique needs to be applied (i.e., whether \mathbf{X}_t is indeed $I(1)$), or not.

Several interesting questions and possible extensions are still outstanding. In addition to deriving the limiting distributions of the estimated loadings, common factors and common components (which, in principle, can be done as an extension of our results), and to extending our results to the presence of deterministic components (such as drifts or linear trends in the common $I(1)$ structure), here we revisit the notion of cointegration and how this can be cast into our model (1). In particular, we note that our current model and theory can only partly embed a (Matrix) Error Correction Model ([Johansen, 1991](#)). Indeed, consider again the two-step hierarchical representation discussed in the introduction, and, unless stated otherwise, assume for simplicity that $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$. Recalling that $\mathbf{X}_{\cdot,j,t}$, $1 \leq j \leq p_2$ denotes the j -th column of \mathbf{X}_t , consider the $\text{MA}(\infty)$ representation $\Delta \mathbf{X}_{\cdot,j,t} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_j(L) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\cdot,j,t}$, where $\mathbf{\Gamma}_j(L) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{j,h} L^h$ is a $p_1 \times p_1$ -valued $\text{MA}(\infty)$ polynomial. Then, by standard arguments,² we can represent $\mathbf{X}_{\cdot,j,t}$ as

$$(33) \quad \mathbf{X}_{\cdot,j,t} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_j(1) \sum_{s=1}^t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\cdot,j,s} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_j^*(L) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\cdot,j,t},$$

where $\mathbf{\Gamma}_j(1) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{j,h}$ is a $p_1 \times p_1$ matrix with rank h_{R_1} , and $\mathbf{\Gamma}_j^*(L) = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{j,h}^* L^h$ with $\mathbf{\Gamma}_{j,h}^* = -\sum_{k=h+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{j,k}$. Hence, $\mathbf{\Gamma}_j(1)$ can be rewritten as the product between a $p_1 \times h_{R_1}$ matrix (say \mathbf{R}_1) and an $h_{R_1} \times p_1$ matrix (say $\mathbf{\Pi}_j$), whence (33) becomes

$$\mathbf{X}_{\cdot,j,t} = \underset{p_1 \times k_R k_R \times p_1}{\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{\Pi}_j} \sum_{s=1}^t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\cdot,j,s} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_j^*(L) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\cdot,j,t}.$$

Define, for short, the scalar common trend $\mathbf{G}_{j,t} = \mathbf{\Pi}_j \sum_{s=1}^t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\cdot,j,s}$, and consider the $p_2 \times 1$ vector of common trends $\mathbf{G}_t = (\mathbf{G}_{1,t}, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{p_2,t})'$. The vector \mathbf{G}_t itself could be cointegrated; considering the $\text{MA}(\infty)$

²See e.g. [Watson \(1994\)](#)

representation $\Delta \mathbf{G}_t = \mathbf{\Gamma}_G(L) \mathbf{u}_t$, it follows that

$$(34) \quad \mathbf{G}_t = \mathbf{\Gamma}_G(1) \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbf{u}_s + \mathbf{\Gamma}_G^*(L) \mathbf{u}_t.$$

Again, $\mathbf{\Gamma}_G(1)$ is $p_2 \times p_2$ and has rank $h_{C_1} = 1$, so that we can write

$$\mathbf{G}_t = \mathbf{\Gamma}_G(1) \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbf{u}_s + \mathbf{\Gamma}_G^*(L) \mathbf{u}_t = \underset{p_2 \times h_{C_1}}{\mathbf{C}_1} \underset{h_{C_1} \times p_2}{\beta'_G} \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbf{u}_s + \mathbf{\Gamma}_G^*(L) \mathbf{u}_t = \underset{p_2 \times h_{C_1}}{\mathbf{C}_1} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} + \mathbf{\Gamma}_G^*(L) \mathbf{u}_t,$$

where $\mathbf{F}'_{1,t} = \beta'_G \sum_{s=1}^t \mathbf{u}_s$ is the common stochastic trend. Then, by substituting, we have

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{G}'_t + \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_t$ is a stationary matrix-valued whose j -th column is given by $\mathbf{\Gamma}_j^*(L) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{.j,t}$ in (33); using (34), we receive

$$(35) \quad \mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 + \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{u}'_t [\mathbf{\Gamma}_G^*(1)]' + \mathbf{E}_t,$$

where \mathbf{E}_t is the overall error term. In this model, we have the same structure for the common stochastic trend(s) $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ as in model (1). However, the common stationary component $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{u}'_t [\mathbf{\Gamma}_G^*(L)]'$ is different to the one in (1), in that $\mathbf{\Gamma}_G^*(1)$ may have full rank, thus entailing that the stationary common component $\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{u}'_t [\mathbf{\Gamma}_G^*(1)]'$ does not have a “two-way” but a “one-way” structure. Our assumptions hereafter are also different to the ones implicitly present in (35), seeing as we assume that $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$ are independent, whereas, in (35), $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ and \mathbf{u}_t clearly are not. Hence, the extension of our methodology to a cointegrated system - whilst building on the methodology developed herein - is a not entirely trivial task, which is currently under investigation by the authors.

As a second extension, augmenting (1)-(2) to include linear trends could be also of interest. In such a case, (1) would become

$$(36) \quad \mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{A}t\mathbf{B}' + \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 + \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 + \mathbf{E}_t.$$

An “anti-projection” based estimation strategy, in this case, could be based on estimating \mathbf{C}_1 and \mathbf{C}_0 from the first-differenced version of (36)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{X}_t &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}' + \mathbf{R}_1 \Delta \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 + \mathbf{R}_0 \Delta \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 + \Delta \mathbf{E}_t \\ &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}' + \mathbf{R} \Delta \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{C} + \Delta \mathbf{E}_t, \end{aligned}$$

using e.g. the projection-based estimator of Yu et al. (2022) (denoting this as, say, $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}$), and subsequently estimating \mathbf{A} from the anti-projected version of \mathbf{X}_t , viz. $\mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\perp}$. This extension, as well as the case where one of the common $I(1)$ factor has a drift component, is also under investigation by the authors.

REFERENCES

- Ahn, S. C. and A. R. Horenstein (2013). Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors. *Econometrica* 81(3), 1203–1227.
- Alessi, L., M. Barigozzi, and M. Capasso (2010). Improved penalization for determining the number of factors in approximate static factor models. *Statistics and Probability Letters* 80, 1806–1813.
- Aue, A., S. Hörmann, L. Horváth, and M. Hušková (2014). Dependent functional linear models with applications to monitoring structural change. *Statistica Sinica* 24(3), 1043–1073.
- Aue, A., S. Hörmann, L. Horváth, and M. Reimherr (2009). Break detection in the covariance structure of multivariate time series models. *Annals of Statistics* 37, 4046–4087.
- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica* 71, 135–171.
- Bai, J. (2004). Estimating cross-section common stochastic trends in nonstationary panel data. *Journal of Econometrics* 122, 137–183.
- Barigozzi, M., G. Cavaliere, and L. Trapani (2024). Inference in heavy-tailed nonstationary multivariate time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 119(545), 565–581.
- Barigozzi, M. and L. Trapani (2022). Testing for common trends in nonstationary large datasets. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 40(3), 1107–1122.
- Berkes, I., S. Hörmann, and J. Schauer (2011). Split invariance principles for stationary processes. *Annals of Probability* 39(6), 2441–2473.
- Bykhovskaya, A. and V. Gorin (2022). Cointegration in large VARs. *The Annals of Statistics* 50(3), 1593–1617.
- Chamberlain, G. and M. Rothschild (1983). Arbitrage, factor structure, and mean-variance analysis on large asset markets. *Econometrica* 51, 1305–1324.
- Chen, E. Y. and J. Fan (2023). Statistical inference for high-dimensional matrix-variate factor models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 118(542), 1038–1055.
- Chen, E. Y., D. Xia, C. Cai, and J. Fan (2024). Semi-parametric tensor factor analysis by iteratively projected singular value decomposition. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 86(3), 793–823.
- Chen, R., D. Yang, and C.-H. Zhang (2022). Factor models for high-dimensional tensor time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 117(537), 94–116.

- Donsker, M. and S. Varadhan (1977). On laws of the iterated logarithm for local times. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 30(6), 707–753.
- Gao, Z., C. Yuan, J. B., W. Huang, and G. J. (2021). A two-way factor model for high-dimensional matrix data.
- Hallin, M. and R. Liška (2007). Determining the number of factors in the general dynamic factor model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 102, 603–617.
- Hamilton, J. D. and J. Xi (2024). Principal component analysis for nonstationary series. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Han, Y., R. Chen, and C.-H. Zhang (2022). Rank determination in tensor factor model. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 16(1), 1726–1803.
- He, Y., X. Kong, L. Trapani, and L. Yu (2023). One-way or two-way factor model for matrix sequences? *Journal of Econometrics* 235(2), 1981–2004.
- Hecq, A., I. Ricardo, and I. Wilms (2024). Detecting cointegrating relations in non-stationary matrix-valued time series.
- Horváth, L. and L. Trapani (2023). Change-point detection in heteroscedastic random coefficient autoregressive models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 41(4), 1300–1314.
- Ibragimov, I. A. (1962). Some limit theorems for stationary processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 7(4), 349–382.
- Johansen, S. (1991). Estimation and hypothesis testing of cointegration vectors in gaussian vector autoregressive models. *Econometrica* 59(6), 1551–80.
- Lam, C. and Q. Yao (2012). Factor modeling for high-dimensional time series: inference for the number of factors. *Annals of Statistics* 40(2), 694–726.
- Li, W. V. (2001). Small ball probabilities for Gaussian Markov processes under the L_p -norm. *Stochastic processes and their applications* 92(1), 87–102.
- Li, Z. and H. Xiao (2024). Cointegrated matrix autoregression models.
- Liu, W. and Z. Lin (2009). Strong approximation for a class of stationary processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 119(1), 249–280.
- Massacci, D. and L. Trapani (2022). High dimensional threshold regression with common stochastic trends.
- Matoušek, J. (2008). On variants of the Johnson–Lindenstrauss lemma. *Random Structures & Algorithms* 33(2), 142–156.
- Merikoski, J. K. and R. Kumar (2004). Inequalities for spreads of matrix sums and products. *Applied Mathematics E-Notes* 4, 150–159.

- Móricz, F. (1976). Moment inequalities and the strong laws of large numbers. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* 35(4), 299–314.
- Onatski, A. and C. Wang (2018). Alternative asymptotics for cointegration tests in large VARs. *Econometrica* 86(4), 1465–1478.
- Onatski, A. and C. Wang (2019). Extreme canonical correlations and high-dimensional cointegration analysis. *Journal of Econometrics* 212(1), 307–322.
- Stock, J. H. (1987). Asymptotic properties of least squares estimators of cointegrating vectors. *Econometrica* 55(5), 1035–1056.
- Stock, J. H. and M. W. Watson (1988). Variable trends in economic time series. *Journal of economic perspectives* 2(3), 147–174.
- Wang, D., X. Liu, and R. Chen (2019). Factor models for matrix-valued high-dimensional time series. *Journal of Econometrics* 208(1), 231–248.
- Watson, M. (1994). Vector autoregressions and cointegration. *Handbook of Econometrics* 4, 2843–2915.
- Wu, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102(40), 14150–14154.
- Yu, L., Y. He, X. Kong, and X. Zhang (2022). Projected estimation for large-dimensional matrix factor models. *Journal of Econometrics* 229(1), 201–217.

APPENDIX A. TECHNICAL LEMMAS

Henceforth, whenever possible in this and in the next section, for simplicity and without loss of generality we will carry out our proofs under the constraints $h_{R_1} = 1$, $h_{C_1} = 1$, $h_{R_0} = 1$, and $h_{C_0} = 1$.

Lemma 5. *Consider a multi-index random variable U_{i_1, \dots, i_h} , with $1 \leq i_1 \leq S_1$, $1 \leq i_2 \leq S_2$, etc. . . Assume that*

$$(37) \quad \sum_{S_1} \cdots \sum_{S_h} \frac{1}{S_1 \cdots S_h} P \left(\max_{1 \leq i_1 \leq S_1, \dots, 1 \leq i_h \leq S_h} |U_{i_1, \dots, i_h}| > \epsilon L_{S_1, \dots, S_h} \right) < \infty,$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$ and a sequence L_{S_1, \dots, S_h} defined as

$$L_{S_1, \dots, S_h} = S_1^{d_1} \cdots S_h^{d_h} l_1(S_1) \cdots l_h(S_h),$$

where d_1, d_2 , etc. are non-negative numbers and $l_1(\cdot), l_2(\cdot)$, etc. are slowly varying functions in the sense of Karamata. Then it holds that

$$(38) \quad \limsup_{(S_1, \dots, S_h) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|U_{S_1, \dots, S_h}|}{L_{S_1, \dots, S_h}} = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. The lemma is shown in [Massacci and Trapani \(2022\)](#) - see in particular Lemma A11 therein. \square

Lemma 6. *We assume that Assumption 1 is satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$(39) \quad E \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F^2 \leq c_0 t,$$

$$(40) \quad \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right\|_F^2 = O_P(T^2)$$

Proof. Equation (39) follows immediately from Proposition 4 in [Berkes et al. \(2011\)](#). As far as (40) is concerned, it follows immediately from the FCLT for Bernoulli shifts (e.g., Theorem A.1 in [Aue et al., 2009](#)) and the Continuous Mapping Theorem. \square

Lemma 7. *We assume that Assumption 1 is satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$(41) \quad \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} = D_1 \text{ a.s.},$$

$$(42) \quad \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} = D_2 \text{ a.s.},$$

where D_1 and D_2 are two positive definite matrices of dimensions $h_{R_1} \times h_{R_1}$ and $h_{C_1} \times h_{C_1}$ respectively.

Proof. We prove (41) - the proof of (42) is the same. Assumption 1 entails that, for each T , it is possible to define a matrix valued, $h_{R_1} \times h_{C_1}$ -dimensional Wiener process $\{\mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(k), 1 \leq k \leq T\}$, with covariance matrix $\Sigma_F^{(a)}$ such that

$$(43) \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\mathbf{F}_{1,k} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(k)\| = O_{a.s.} \left(T^{1/2-\zeta} \right),$$

for some $\zeta > 0$ (a proof can be found e.g. in [Aue et al., 2014](#)). Considering

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T}(t) + \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T}(t) \\ &+ \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t) (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)) + \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)) (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t))', \end{aligned}$$

equation (43) entails

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T}(t) \right\| \\ & \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)\| \|\mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)\| \leq T \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\mathbf{F}_{1,k} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(k)\| \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(k)\| \\ & = T \cdot O_{a.s.} \left(T^{1/2-\zeta} \right) O_{a.s.} \left(T^{1/2} (\log \log T)^{1/2} \right) = O_{a.s.} \left(T^{2-\zeta} (\log \log T)^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and by the same token

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)) (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t))' \right\| \\ & \leq T \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \|\mathbf{F}_{1,k} - \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(k)\| \right)^2 = O_{a.s.} \left(T^{2-2\zeta} \right), \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} = \frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T}(t) + o_{a.s.}(1).$$

Note now that, letting $\mathbf{W}_{RC,T,j}(t)$ be the j -th column of $\mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)$

$$\frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{W}_{RC,T,j}(t) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T,j}(t).$$

We now show that the limit of the expression above is positive definite. To this end, let \mathbf{b} be a $h_{C_1} \times 1$ nontrivial vector and consider

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{b}' \mathbf{W}_{RC,T,j}(t) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T,j}(t) \mathbf{b};$$

given that the distribution of $\mathbf{W}_{RC,T}(t)$, does not depend on T , we have that $\{\mathbf{b}' \mathbf{W}_{RC,T,j}(t), 1 \leq t \leq T\} \stackrel{D}{=} \{\widetilde{W}_j(t), 1 \leq t \leq T\}$, where $\{\widetilde{W}_j(t), 1 \leq t \leq T\}$ is a scalar Wiener process with variance such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \mathbf{b}' E(\mathbf{W}_{RC,T,j}(1) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T,j}(1)) \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}' \Sigma_F^{(a)} \mathbf{b}.$$

Using equation (4.6) in [Donsker and Varadhan \(1977\)](#), it therefore follows that

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{b}' \mathbf{W}_{RC,T,j}(t) \mathbf{W}'_{RC,T,j}(t) \mathbf{b} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{b}' \Sigma_F^{(a)} \mathbf{b},$$

a.s.; seeing as $\Sigma_F^{(a)}$ is positive definite by Assumption 1(ii)(a), $\mathbf{b}' \Sigma_F^{(a)} \mathbf{b} > 0$ for all nontrivial \mathbf{b} . The desired result now follows. \square

Lemma 8. *We assume that Assumption 2 is satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$(44) \quad \sum_{t,s=1}^T \|E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}'_{0,s})\|_F \leq c_0 T, \text{ and } \sum_{t,s=1}^T \|E(\mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})\|_F \leq c_1 T,$$

$$(45) \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2 = O_{a.s.}(T),$$

for some $0 < c_0, c_1 < \infty$.

Proof. Equation (44) is a direct consequence of Assumption 2 - see in particular the proof of Lemma A.3 in [Massacci and Trapani \(2022\)](#). As far as (45) is concerned, we begin by showing that $\|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2$ is an \mathcal{L}_2 -decomposable Bernoulli shift, focusing on the case $h_{R_0} = h_{C_0} = 1$ for simplicity and with no loss of generality. Consider the construction

$$\mathbf{F}_{0,t,t}^* = g_{\mathbf{F}_0} \left(\eta_t^{\mathbf{F}_0}, \dots, \eta_1^{\mathbf{F}_0}, \widetilde{\eta}_0^{\mathbf{F}_0}, \widetilde{\eta}_{-1}^{\mathbf{F}_0}, \dots \right).$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^2 - (\mathbf{F}_{0,t,t}^*)^2 \right|_2 &\leq |\mathbf{F}_{0,t} + \mathbf{F}_{0,t,t}^*|_4 |\mathbf{F}_{0,t} - \mathbf{F}_{0,t,t}^*|_4 \\ &\leq 2 |\mathbf{F}_{0,t}|_4 |\mathbf{F}_{0,t} - \mathbf{F}_{0,t,t}^*|_4 \leq c_0^{-a}, \end{aligned}$$

which entails that $\|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2$ is a \mathcal{L}_2 -decomposable Bernoulli shift. Hence, by Proposition 4 in [Berkes et al. \(2011\)](#), it follows that

$$E \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2 - E \|\mathbf{F}_{0,0}\|_F^2 \right) \right|^2 \leq c_0 T,$$

and therefore Theorem 3 in [Móricz \(1976\)](#) yields

$$E \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left| \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2 - E \|\mathbf{F}_{0,0}\|_F^2 \right) \right|^2 \leq c_0 T (\log 2T)^4.$$

Equation (45) readily follows from the SLLN. \square

Lemma 9. *We assume that Assumptions 1, 2 and 5 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right\|_F = O_P(T).$$

Proof. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right\|_F^2 &= \sum_{t,s=1}^T E (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,s} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s}) \leq \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,s})| |E (\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})| \\ &\leq \sum_{t,s=1}^T \left| \left(E \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(E \|\mathbf{F}_{1,s}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \right| |E (\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})| \\ &\leq c_0 T \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E (\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})| \leq c_1 T^2, \end{aligned}$$

having used Assumptions 1 and 2, (39) in the penultimate passage, and (44) in the last one. The desired result now follows immediately from Markov inequality. \square

Lemma 10. *We assume that Assumption 3 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$(46) \quad \lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' \right) = O(p_2 T) + O_P \left(p_1 p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2} \right),$$

$$(47) \quad \lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{E}_t \right) = O(p_1 T) + O_P \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2 T^{1/2} \right).$$

Proof. We can write

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' = E \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' \right) + \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' - E (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t')),$$

whence by Weyl's inequality

$$\lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' \right) \leq \lambda_{\max} \left(E \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' \right) \right) + \lambda_{\max} ((\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' - E (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t'))) = I + II.$$

Using again Weyl's inequality, it holds that

$$\lambda_{\max} \left(E \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' \right) \right) \leq \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_{\max} (E (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t')),$$

and by Assumption 3(ii)(b)

$$\lambda_{\max} (E (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t')) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{h=1}^{p_1} |E (e_{ij,t} e_{hj,t})| \leq c_0 p_2,$$

whence finally it follows that $\lambda_{\max} \left(E \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' \right) \right) = O(p_2 T)$. Also, by symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_{\max} ((\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' - E (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t'))) \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' - E (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t')\|_F = \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{p_1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^{p_2} (e_{ik,t} e_{jk,t} - E (e_{ik,t} e_{jk,t})) \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & E \sum_{i,j=1}^{p_1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^{p_2} (e_{ik,t} e_{jk,t} - E (e_{ik,t} e_{jk,t})) \right)^2 \\ & = \sum_{i,j=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{h,k=1}^{p_2} \text{Cov} (e_{ik,t} e_{jk,t}, e_{ih,s} e_{jh,s}) \leq c_0 p_1^2 p_2 T, \end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 3(iii)(a). Hence by Markov inequality it finally follows that

$$\lambda_{\max} ((\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' - E (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t'))) = O_P \left(p_1 p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2} \right),$$

whence (46) follows. Equation (47) follows from the same logic. \square

Lemma 11. *We assume that Assumptions 1, 3 and 5 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F = O_P \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T \right).$$

Proof. We let $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$ for simplicity. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F^2 \\ & = E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} e_{ij,t} \right)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T E (\mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,s}) E (e_{ij,t} e_{ij,s}) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T E (\mathbf{F}_{1,t}^2) |E (e_{ij,t} e_{ij,s})| \leq c_0 T \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E (e_{ij,t} e_{ij,s})| \leq c_1 p_1 p_2 T, \end{aligned}$$

by Assumptions 5 (used in the second line) and 3(ii)(a), used in the third line. \square

Lemma 12. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exists a positive, finite constant c_0 and a triplet of random variables $(p_{0,0}, p_{2,0}, T_0)$ such that, for all $p_1 \geq p_{0,0}$, $p_2 \geq p_{2,0}$ and $T \geq T_0$, it holds that*

$$(\log \log T) \lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{R_1}) \geq c_0, \quad \text{for all } j \leq h_{R_1},$$

and, for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{R_1}) = o_{a.s.} \left(\frac{(\log T)^{3/2+\epsilon}}{T} \right), \quad \text{for all } j > h_{R_1}.$$

Proof. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (48) \quad \mathbf{M}_{R_1} &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}'_t + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \\ &= I + II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI'. \end{aligned}$$

We begin by finding bounds for II , III , IV , V , and VI , using $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = h_{R_0} = h_{C_0} = 1$ for simplicity whenever possible. We have

$$\|II\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^2 \right) = O_{a.s.} \left(\frac{1}{T} \right),$$

having used Assumption 4(i)(b) and (45) in Lemma 8. Turning to III , combining Lemmas 5 and 10, it is easy to see that

$$\lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}'_t \right) = O \left(\frac{1}{p_1 T} \right) + o_{a.s.} \left(\frac{(\log p_1 \log p_2 \log T)^{1+\epsilon}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right).$$

We now study

$$\|IV\|_F = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \left(\sum_{i,h=1}^{p_1} \left(r_i \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j \mathbf{F}_{1,t} e_{hj,t} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2};$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \sum_{i,h=1}^{p_1} r_i^2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j \mathbf{F}_{1,t} e_{hj,t} \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i,h=1}^{p_1} r_i^2 E \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{j,k=1}^{p_2} c_j c_k \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,s} e_{hj,t} e_{hk,s} \\
&\leq \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p_1} r_i^2 \right) \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p_2} c_i^2 \right) \sum_{i,h=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{j,k=1}^{p_2} \left| \left(E \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(E \|\mathbf{F}_{1,s}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \right| |E(e_{hj,t} e_{hk,s})| \\
&\leq c_0 p_1 T \sum_{h=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{j,k=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{hj,t} e_{hk,s})| \leq c_1 p_1^2 p_2 T^2,
\end{aligned}$$

having used Assumption 5 in the third line, Assumption 4(ii)(d) in the last passage. Hence, using Lemma 5

$$\|IV\|_F = o_{a.s.} \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T} (\log p_1 \log^2 p_2 \log^2 T)^{1/2+\epsilon} \right),$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$. The same bound holds, by symmetry, for $\|IV'\|_F$. We now study

$$\|V\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{R}'_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right) \leq c_0 \frac{1}{T^2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right)^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{t,s=1}^T \left(E \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(E \|\mathbf{F}_{1,s}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \|E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})\|_F \leq c_0 T \sum_{t,s=1}^T \|E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})\|_F \leq c_1 T^2,
\end{aligned}$$

having used Assumption 5 and (39) in Lemma 6 and (45) in Lemma 8 in the last passage. Hence, by Lemma 5

$$\|V\|_F = o_{a.s.} \left(\frac{1}{T} (\log T)^{3/2+\epsilon} \right),$$

and the same bound holds, by symmetry, for $\|V'\|_F$. Finally, we study

$$\|VI\|_F = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F.$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(49) \quad & E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F^2 \\
&= E \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T c_{1,j} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} e_{ij,t} \right)^2 \right) = E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T c_{1,j} c_{1,k} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s} e_{ij,t} e_{ik,s} \\
&\leq \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p_2} c_{1,i}^2 \right) \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T E \left(\|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} E \left(\|\mathbf{F}_{0,s}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} |E(e_{ij,t} e_{ik,s})|.
\end{aligned}$$

Seeing as $\mathbf{F}_{0,t}$ is stationary, using Assumption 2(ii)(d), the above is bounded by

$$c_0 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E(e_{ij,t} e_{ik,s})| \leq c_1 p_1 p_2 T,$$

whence using Lemma 5

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F = o_{a.s.} \left((p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} (\log p_1 \log^2 p_2 \log^2 T)^{3/2+\epsilon} \right).$$

In turn, using Assumption 4(ii), this yields

$$\|VI\|_F = o_{a.s.} \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} (\log p_1 \log^2 p_2 \log^2 T)^{3/2+\epsilon} \right).$$

The same bound holds, by symmetry, for $\|VI'\|_F$.

Putting together all the above, by symmetry it follows that

$$(50) \quad \lambda_{\max}(II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI') = o_{a.s.} \left(\frac{(\log T)^{3/2+\epsilon}}{T} \right).$$

Finally, consider I in (48). By construction, $\lambda_j(I) = 0$ a.s. for all $j > h_{R_1}$; when $j \leq h_{R_1}$, it holds that

$$\lambda_j \left(\frac{\log \log T}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \right) = \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{R}_1 \left(\frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \mathbf{R}'_1 \right),$$

seeing as $\mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 = p_2 \mathbf{I}_{h_{C_1}}$; using the multiplicative version of Weyl's inequality (see e.g. Theorem 7 in Merikoski and Kumar, 2004)

$$\begin{aligned}
(51) \quad & \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{R}_1 \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \mathbf{R}'_1 \right) \\
& \geq \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \lambda_{\min} \left(\left(\frac{\log \log T}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \right) \geq c_0 \text{ a.s.},
\end{aligned}$$

having used Assumption 4(ii) and Lemma 7. The desired results now follow by combining (51) and (50), using Weyl's inequality. \square

Lemma 13. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exists a positive, finite constant c_0 and a triplet of random variables $(p_{0,0}, p_{2,0}, T_0)$ such that, for all $p_1 \geq p_{0,0}$, $p_2 \geq p_{2,0}$ and $T \geq T_0$, it holds that*

$$(\log \log T) \lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{C_1}) \geq c_0, \quad \text{for all } j \leq h_{C_1}.$$

and, for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{C_1}) = o_{a.s.} \left(\frac{(\log T)^{3/2+\epsilon}}{T} \right), \quad \text{for all } j > h_{C_1}.$$

Proof. The proof is the same, *mutatis mutandis*, as that of Lemma 12 and therefore we omit it. \square

Lemma 14. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$(52) \quad \|\Lambda_{R_1}^{-1}\| = O_P(1),$$

$$(53) \quad \|\Lambda_{C_1}^{-1}\| = O_P(1).$$

Proof. We consider (52) only; the proof of (53) is similar. Following the passages in the proof of Lemma 12 therein *verbatim*, it is easy to see that (50) becomes

$$\lambda_{\max}(II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI') = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).$$

Similarly, when $j \leq h_{R_1}$, it holds that

$$\lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \right) \geq \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \lambda_{\min} \left(\left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \right),$$

recalling the identification restriction $\mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C} = p_2 \mathbf{I}_{h_{C_1}}$. Using the multiplicative version of Weyl's inequality (see e.g. Theorem 7 in Merikoski and Kumar, 2004)

$$\lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{R}_1 \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \mathbf{R}'_1 \right) \geq \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \lambda_{\min} \left(\left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \right).$$

By Assumption 4(ii), $\lambda_j(\mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1 / p_1) > 0$. Let now \mathbf{b} be a nonzero $h_{R_1} \times 1$ vector; it is immediate to see that $\mathbf{b}' \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ is a decomposable Bernoulli shift with the same rate as $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$. Hence, the FCLT for Bernoulli shifts (see Theorem A.1 in Aue et al., 2009) entails that

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{b}' \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{b} \leq \epsilon' \right) \leq P \left(\int_0^1 W^2(r) dr \leq \epsilon' \right),$$

where $\{W(r), 0 \leq r \leq 1\}$ is a Wiener process with variance $\mathbf{b}'\Sigma_F^{(a)}\mathbf{b}$; Assumption 1 (ii) entails that $\mathbf{b}'\Sigma_F^{(a)}\mathbf{b} > 0$.

Hence, using e.g. Theorem 1.1 in Li (2001), for any $\epsilon' \rightarrow 0^+$

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{b}' \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{b} \leq \epsilon' \right) \\ & \leq P \left(\int_0^1 W^2(r) dr \leq \epsilon' \right) = \exp \left(-\frac{1}{8\epsilon'} \right) = \epsilon'', \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$P \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{b}' \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{b} > \epsilon' \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon''.$$

In turn, this readily entails that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left(\lambda_{\min} \left(\left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \right) > 0 \right) = 1,$$

which implies the desired result. \square

Lemma 15. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that $\left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\| = O_P(1)$.*

Proof. Some arguments in the proof are the same as in the proof of Lemma 12, to which we refer for details.

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}^\dagger &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \\ &= I + II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI'. \end{aligned}$$

We begin by finding bounds for II , III , IV , V , and VI , using $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = h_{R_0} = h_{C_1} = 1$ for simplicity whenever possible. By standard arguments, we have

$$\|II\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F^2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^2 \right) = O_{a.s.} \left(\frac{1}{T} \right).$$

Following the proof of Lemma 12, it is immediate to see that $\|III\|_F$, $\|IV\|_F$, $\|V\|_F$, and $\|VI\|_F$ are all dominated by $\|II\|_F$. This entails that

$$\lambda_{\max}(II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI') = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T}\right),$$

and therefore

$$\lambda_j\left(\hat{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}^\dagger\right) = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T}\right),$$

for all $j > h_{R_1}$. Consider now I ; it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}\right) \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}\right)' \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}\right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}\right)' \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\ &= I_a + I_b + I'_b + I_c. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F^3 \|\mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F^2 \right) \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1 p_2^{3/2} \frac{p_2^{1/2}}{T} T^2 = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and the same holds for $\|I'_b\|_F$. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \|I_c\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F^2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F^2 \right) \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1 p_2 \frac{p_2}{T^2} T^2 = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, it holds that, for all $j \leq h_{R_1}$

$$\lambda_j(I_a) \geq \lambda_j\left(\frac{\mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1}{p_1}\right) \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t}\right).$$

Recall that Theorem 1 states that $\mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{H}_{C_1} = \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}} + o_P(1)$, which entails that $\mathbf{H}_{C_1} \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} = \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}} + o_P(1)$.

Now the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 14 entail that $P(\lambda_j(I_a) > 0) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, which implies the desired result. \square

Lemma 16. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that $\left\| \left(\Lambda_{C_1}^\dagger\right)^{-1} \right\| = O_P(1)$.*

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as that of Lemma 15. \square

Lemma 17. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \right).$$

Proof. Recall that, by construction, $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 = p_1 \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}}$; recall the identification restriction $\mathbf{R}_1' \mathbf{R}_1 = p_1 \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}}$; and finally, recall (64), viz.

$$\mathbf{H}'_{R_1} \mathbf{H}_{R_1} = \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}} + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \right).$$

Then, using Theorem 1, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \\ &= \left\| \mathbf{I}_{p_1} - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' - \left(\mathbf{I}_{p_1} - \mathbf{R}_1 \left(\mathbf{R}_1' \mathbf{R}_1 \right)^{-1} \mathbf{R}_1' \right) \right\|_F \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1} \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_1' - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \right\|_F + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p_1} \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right)' - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{R}_1' \right\|_F + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{p_1} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}'_{R_1} \right\|_F + \frac{1}{p_1} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right\|_F^2 + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \right) \\ &= O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 18. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \right).$$

Proof. The proof follows from the same arguments as the proof of Lemma 17. \square

Lemma 19. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exists a positive constant c_0 such that*

$$\lambda_j \left(\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1,\perp} \right) = c_0 + o_P(1),$$

for all $j \leq h_{R_1}$, and

$$\lambda_j \left(\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1,\perp} \right) = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \right),$$

for all $j > h_{R_1}$.

Proof. Some arguments are repetitive and similar to the proof of Lemma 12, and therefore we omit them when possible for brevity. By construction

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1, \perp} &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right)' + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \right)' \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right)' \\
&= I + II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI'.
\end{aligned}$$

We begin by noting that we can always write

$$(54) \quad \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} = \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right).$$

We will work under the restrictions $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$, for simplicity and with no loss of generality, and, when possible, $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$. We begin by studying

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I\|_F &= \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \right\|_F \\
&\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F^2 \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F^2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F^2 \right) \\
&= O_P(T^2) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1 p_2 \frac{1}{T^2} = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2 T}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

by virtue of (54) and Lemma 18. Using the fact that $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}$ is symmetric and idempotent, we have

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} = \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)^2 = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp};$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
III &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \\
&= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}) \mathbf{E}_t' \\
&= III_a + III_b.
\end{aligned}$$

Seeing as

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' = \sum_{t=1}^T E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t') + \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t')),$$

we have (denoting the element in position j , h of $\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}$ as $c_{\perp,hj}$)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t') \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_{\max} (E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t')) \leq \left(\max_{1 \leq h, j \leq p_2} (c_{\perp,hj})^2 \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \max_{1 \leq i \leq p_1} \sum_{k=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{ij,t} e_{kh,t})| \\
&\leq c_0 T p_2,
\end{aligned}$$

and, after some algebra

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t')) \right\|_F^2 \\
&\leq c_0 \sum_{i,j=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4=1}^{p_2} |\text{Cov}(e_{ih_1,t} e_{jh_2,t}, e_{ih_3,s} e_{jh_4,s})| \\
&\leq c_0 p_1^2 T p_2^3,
\end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 3(iii), whence ultimately

$$\|III_a\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right).$$

Also, by similar calculations as above, it is not hard to see that $\sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{E}_t\|_F^2 = O_P(p_1 p_2 T)$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\|III_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{E}_t\|_F^2 \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1 p_2 T \frac{1}{T} = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2 T} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

whence ultimately

$$(55) \quad \|III\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right).$$

Further, again exploiting idempotency and (54)

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV\|_F &= \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}) \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} (p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T) = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2 T}\right), \end{aligned}$$

having used Lemma 11. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_F &= \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}) \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \right\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1 p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} T = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2 T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} VI &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}) \mathbf{E}'_t \\ &= VI_a + VI_b. \end{aligned}$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right\|_F^2 &= E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_{\perp,hj} e_{ij,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{p_2} c_{\perp,hj_1} c_{\perp,hj_2} E(e_{ij_1,t} e_{ij_2,s}) E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s}) \\ &\leq \left(\max_{1 \leq h, j \leq p_2} c_{\perp,hj} \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{ij_1,t} e_{ij_2,s})| |E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})| \\ &\leq c_0 \left(\max_{1 \leq h, j \leq p_2} c_{\perp,hj} \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{ij_1,t} e_{ij_2,s})| \leq c_1 p_1 p_2^2 T, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|VI_a\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_2 T^{1/2} = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \|VI_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2} = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2 T^{3/2}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

so that ultimately

$$\|VI\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right).$$

Putting all together, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_{\max}(I + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI') \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consider now II ; by construction, $\lambda_j(II) = 0$ whenever $j > h_{R_1}$. Further

$$\begin{aligned} II &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \\ &= II_a + II_b. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by standard algebra

$$\|\mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0\|_F = c_0 p_2^2,$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|II_a\|_F &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t}) \mathbf{R}'_0 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 (\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} - E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t})) \mathbf{R}'_0 \\ &= II_{a,1} + II_{a,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Assumptions 2 and 4, it is easy to see via tedious but elementary passages that $\lambda_j(II_{a,1}) \geq c_0$, and $\lambda_{\max}(II_{a,2}) = O_P(T^{-1/2})$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \|II_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2 \\ &= O_P(T) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1 p_2 \frac{1}{T} = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2 T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Putting all together, it follows that

$$\lambda_j(II) = c_0 + o_P(1),$$

for all $j \leq h_{R_1}$. The desired result now follows from Weyl's inequality. \square

Lemma 20. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exists a positive constant c_0 such that*

$$\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{C_1,\perp}) = c_0 + o_P(1),$$

for all $j \leq h_{C_0}$, and

$$\lambda_j(\mathbf{M}_{C_1,\perp}) = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2}\right),$$

for all $j > h_{C_0}$.

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 19, *mutatis mutandis*. \square

Lemma 21. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 hold. Then it holds that*

$$(56) \quad \sigma_{\max} \left[\frac{1}{p_1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \right) \right]$$

$$(57) \quad = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right),$$

and

$$(58) \quad \sigma_{\max} \left[\frac{1}{p_2} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0} \right) \right]$$

$$= O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right).$$

Proof. We only show (56); the proof of (57) is essentially the same. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{p_1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \right) \\
= & \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_0^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
= & I + II + III + IV + V + VI + VII + VIII + IX + X + XI.
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I\|_F &= \left\| \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&\leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F^2 \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F^2 \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F^2 \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t}^2 \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \frac{1}{T} p_1 p_1^{1/2} p_2 \frac{1}{T^2} T^2 = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2 T^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note now that

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{I}_{p_2} - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left[\mathbf{C} (\mathbf{C}' \mathbf{C})^{-1} \mathbf{C}' \right],$$

and since $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{C})^{-1}\mathbf{C}'$ is an idempotent matrix with h_{C_1} nonzero eigenvalues, we have

$$(59) \quad \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \right\|_F = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right),$$

and similarly

$$(60) \quad \left\| \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \right\|_F = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|II\|_F &= \left\| \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \left\| \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^2 \right\|_F \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} p_1 p_1^{1/2} p_1 p_2 \frac{1}{T} T = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and the same rate holds for III ; further

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F^2 \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^2 \right\|_F \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} p_1^{5/2} p_2 \frac{1}{T^2} T = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We now study V , using the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right)' \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right)' \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \right) \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} + V_f \\ &= V_a + V_b + V_c + V_d + V_e + V_f, \end{aligned}$$

where V_f is a remainder which can be shown to be dominated by the other terms. We begin with V_a , and note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \\ = & \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t) \mathbf{R}_0 + \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T [\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t)] \mathbf{R}_0; \end{aligned}$$

the element in position $1 \leq k \leq p_1$ of the vector (recall we are assuming only one factor) $\mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t) \mathbf{R}_0$ is

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{u=1}^{p_1} \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p_2} p_{uikh\ell} = r_{0,u} r_{\perp,ik} c_{\perp,h\ell} E(e_{ih,t} e_{u\ell,t}),$$

where $p_{uikh\ell} = r_{0,u} r_{\perp,ik} c_{\perp,h\ell}$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_{\max} \left(\mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t) \mathbf{R}_0 \right) \\ \leq & \left(\sum_{k=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{u=1}^{p_1} \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p_2} |p_{uikh\ell}| |E(e_{ih,t} e_{u\ell,t})| \right)^{1/2} \\ & \times \left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq p_1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{u=1}^{p_1} \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p_2} |p_{uikh\ell}| |E(e_{ih,t} e_{u\ell,t})| \right)^{1/2} \\ \leq & c_0 (p_1^2 p_2 T)^{1/2} (p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} \leq c_1 p_1^{3/2} p_2 T. \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left\| \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T [\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t)] \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F^2 \\ = & \sum_{k=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4=1}^{p_2} p_{i_1 i_2 k h_1 h_2} p_{i_3 i_4 k h_3 h_4} \text{Cov}(e_{i_1 h_1, t} e_{i_2 h_2, t}, e_{i_3 h_3, s} e_{i_4 h_4, s}) \\ \leq & c_0 \sum_{k=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4=1}^{p_2} |\text{Cov}(e_{i_1 h_1, t} e_{i_2 h_2, t}, e_{i_3 h_3, s} e_{i_4 h_4, s})| \\ \leq & c_0 p_1^4 p_2^3 T, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\left\| \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T [\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t)] \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F = O_P(p_1^2 p_2^{3/2} T^{1/2}).$$

Therefore we have

$$\sigma_{\max}(V_a) = O\left(\frac{p_1^{3/2} p_2 T}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^2 p_2^{3/2} T^{1/2}}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T}\right) = O\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right).$$

We now note that

$$\sigma_{\max} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0 \right) = O_P \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2 T \right) + O_P \left(p_1 p_2^{3/2} T^{1/2} \right).$$

Indeed, the element in position $1 \leq i \leq p_1$ of $\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0$ is given by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j,h=1}^{p_2} r_{0,k} c_{\perp,jh} e_{ij,t} e_{kh,t};$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_{\max} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T E \left(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0 \right) \right) \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i,k=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j,h=1}^{p_2} |r_{0,k} c_{\perp,jh}| |E(e_{ij,t} e_{kh,t})| \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \max_{1 \leq i \leq p_1} \sum_{k=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j,h=1}^{p_2} |r_{0,k} c_{\perp,jh}| |E(e_{ij,t} e_{kh,t})| \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq c_0 (p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} (p_2 T)^{1/2} \leq c_1 p_1^{1/2} p_2 T; \end{aligned}$$

also

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0 - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0)] \right\|_F^2 \\ & \leq c_0 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{h_1, h_2=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4=1}^{p_2} |\text{Cov}(e_{ih_1,t} e_{k_1 h_2,t}, e_{ih_3,s} e_{k_2 h_4,s})| \\ & \leq c_0 p_1^2 p_2^3 T, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T [\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0 - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0)] \right\|_F = O_P \left(p_1 p_2^{3/2} T^{1/2} \right).$$

We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right)' \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \\ & \leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \sigma_{\max} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t' \mathbf{R}_0 \right) \\ & = O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \frac{1}{T} \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2 T + p_1 p_2^{3/2} T^{1/2} \right) = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{3/2} p_2 T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Continuing with V_c , the same passages as in the above yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_c\| &\leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T^2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T^2} (p_1^2 p_2 T)^{1/2} (p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and the same can be shown for V_d and (with a different, but still dominated, rate) V_e . We now turn to VI ; omitting some passages already considered above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|VI\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \\
&\quad \times \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F + r_{p_1 p_2 T},
\end{aligned}$$

where $r_{p_1 p_2 T}$ is a (dominated) remainder term, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} T p_1^{1/2} p_2 = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^{1/2} T^2} \right);
\end{aligned}$$

the same can be shown for VII . Also

$$\begin{aligned}
\|VIII\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F \\
&\quad \times \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2 T^2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and the same holds for IX . Also repeating the passages above, we receive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
\|X\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F + r'_{p_1 p_2 T} \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} p_1 p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_2 = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

with $r'_{p_1 p_2 T}$ a (dominated) remainder. Finally

$$\begin{aligned} \|XI\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \right\| \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F + r''_{p_1 p_2 T} \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2 T} p_1 p_2 T^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

with, as usual, $r''_{p_1 p_2 T}$ a (dominated) remainder. The desired result now follows from putting all together. \square

Lemma 22. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp}\|_F &= O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}}\right), \\ \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F &= O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows from a minor adaptation of the proof of Lemma 17. \square

Lemma 23. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 hold. Let \mathbf{a} be a $p_1 \times 1$ vector with $\|\mathbf{a}\| = O(p_1^{1/2})$, and \mathbf{b} be a $p_2 \times 1$ vector with $\|\mathbf{b}\| = O(p_2^{1/2})$. Then it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma_{\max} \left[\frac{1}{p_1} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} (\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0}) \right] \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{(p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2}}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^2 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{3/2} T^{3/2}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma_{\max} \left[\frac{1}{p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_0}) \right] \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{(p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2}}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1 T^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^2 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^{3/2} T^{3/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as that of Lemma 21, *mutatis mutandis*, using (also) the fact that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp})\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}}\right),$$

and

$$\|\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp})\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}}\right).$$

and the same (with the rates in Lemma 22) for $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}$. \square

Lemma 24. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\frac{1}{T} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right).$$

Proof. We prove the lemma for the case $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$, with no loss of generality. We use the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\ = & \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_\perp \right) \left(\left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right) \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\ & + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_\perp \right) \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \otimes \left(\mathbf{R}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right) \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\ & + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_\perp \right) \left(\left(\mathbf{C}_1 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \otimes \left(\mathbf{R}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right) \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\ & + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right) (\mathbf{C}_1 \otimes \mathbf{R}_1) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t}^2 \\ & + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Vec}(\mathbf{E}_t) \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\ = & I + II + III + IV + V. \end{aligned}$$

Recall (70); it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^2 p_2^{1/2} p_2 p_2^{1/2}} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) p_1^{1/2} p_1 p_1^{1/2} T \\ &= O_P \left(\frac{T}{p_1 p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\left(\frac{T}{p_1} \right)^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and, by the same passages

$$II = O_P \left(\frac{T}{p_1 p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\left(\frac{T}{p_2} \right)^{1/2} \right),$$

and III is dominated by I and II; also

$$\begin{aligned} IV &= \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{C}_1 \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t}^2 \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^2 p_2^{1/2}} \frac{1}{T} p_2^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} T^2 = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned}
V &= (\hat{\mathbf{D}})^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}) (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}) \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Vec}(\mathbf{E}_t) \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\
&= (\hat{\mathbf{D}})^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0) (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}) \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Vec}(\mathbf{E}_t) \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\
&= (\hat{\mathbf{D}})^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0) (\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \otimes \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp}) \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Vec}(\mathbf{E}_t) \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\
&\quad + (\hat{\mathbf{D}})^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0) (\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \otimes (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp})) \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Vec}(\mathbf{E}_t) \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\
&\quad + (\hat{\mathbf{D}})^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0) ((\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}) \otimes \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp}) \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Vec}(\mathbf{E}_t) \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\
&\quad + (\hat{\mathbf{D}})^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0) ((\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}) \otimes (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp})) \sum_{t=1}^T \text{Vec}(\mathbf{E}_t) \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\
&= V_a + V_b + V_c + V_d.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right\|_F^2 \\
&= E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p_2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T r_{\perp,ij} c_{\perp,h\ell} e_{jh,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h_1, h_2=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t, s=1}^T r_{\perp,ij_1} r_{\perp,ij_2} c_{\perp,h_1 \ell} c_{\perp,h_2 \ell} E(\mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,s}) E(e_{j_1 h_1, t} e_{j_2 h_2, s}) \\
&\leq c_0 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h_1, h_2=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t, s=1}^T (E(\mathbf{F}_{1,t}^2) E(\mathbf{F}_{1,s}^2))^{1/2} |E(e_{j_1 h_1, t} e_{j_2 h_2, s})| \\
&\leq c_1 T \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h_1, h_2=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t, s=1}^T |E(e_{ij, t} e_{hk, s})| \leq c_2 (p_1 p_2 T)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

it immediately follows that

$$\|V_a\|_F = O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} (p_1 p_2)^{1/2} (p_1 p_2 T) = O_P\left(\frac{T}{(p_1 p_2)^{1/2}}\right).$$

Similarly, seeing as

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right\|_F^2 \\
&= E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T c_{\perp,hj}^s e_{ij,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right)^2 \leq c_0 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T (E(\mathbf{F}_{1,t}^2) E(\mathbf{F}_{1,s}^2))^{1/2} |E(e_{ij,t} e_{ik,s})| \\
&\leq c_1 p_1 p_2^2 T^2,
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_b\|_F &\leq \left\| (\hat{\mathbf{D}})^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right\|_F^2 \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^2} p_2^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} p_2 T = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^{1/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The same holds for V_c , and V_d is clearly dominated by V_b and V_c . Hence

$$\|V\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{T}{(p_1 p_2)^{1/2}} \right).$$

□

Lemma 25. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exists a positive constant c_0 such that*

$$\lambda_j \left(\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1, PE} \right) = c_0 + o_P(1),$$

for all $j \leq h_{R_1}$, and

$$\lambda_j \left(\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1, PE} \right) = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2 T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T} \right),$$

for all $j > h_{R_1}$.

Proof. The proof repeats several arguments already discussed above, which are therefore omitted. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1, PE} &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \right)' \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \right)' \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \right)' \\
&= I + II + III + III' + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI.
\end{aligned}$$

We have already studied terms $II + III + III'$ in the proof of Lemma 2, with

$$II + III + III' = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2 T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}}\right).$$

Further, write

$$\begin{aligned}
(61) \quad & \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \\
&= \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right) \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 + \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\mathbf{H}'_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)' \\
&+ \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\mathbf{H}'_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \left(\mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)' + \\
&+ \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right) \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\mathbf{H}'_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)' \\
&+ \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right) \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\mathbf{H}'_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \left(\mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)' \\
&+ \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\mathbf{H}'_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)' \\
&+ \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right) \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\mathbf{H}'_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)'.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} IV &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t = IV_a + IV_b; \end{aligned}$$

using (61), we can write

$$IV_a = \sum_{i=1}^7 IV_{a,i}.$$

Following the passages in the above, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_{a,1}\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_2 T)^{1/2}} \right) p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} (p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} \\ &= O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_2 T)^{1/2}} \right) \right); \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_{a,2}\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_1 T)^{1/2}} \right) \right); \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_{a,3}\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 \right\|_F \\ &\quad \times \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{p_1^{1/2} p_2}{p_1 p_2^2 T^{3/2}} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} + \frac{1}{(p_1 \wedge 2 T)^{1/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

having used (18) in the last set of equations. By the same token, it can be shown that $IV_{a,4} - IV_{a,7}$ are all dominated by $IV_{a,1} - IV_{a,3}$. Similarly, using (61), we can write

$$IV_b = \sum_{i=1}^7 IV_{b,i}.$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|IV_{b,1}\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_2 T)^{1/2}} \right) p_2^{1/2} \frac{p_2^{1/2}}{T} (p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{5/2}} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_2 T)^{1/2}} \right) \right);
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|IV_{b,2}\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{5/2}} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_1 T)^{1/2}} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

We now study, along similar lines as the proof of Lemma 24

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{E}_t \\
&= \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right)' \mathbf{E}_t \left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \\
&+ \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \right) \left(\mathbf{R}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right)' \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \\
&+ \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \right) \left(\left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right)' \otimes \left(\mathbf{R}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right)' \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{E}_t \\
&+ \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{C}_1 \right) \otimes \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{E}_t \\
&+ \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \mathbf{E}_t \\
&= a + b + c + d + e.
\end{aligned}$$

By using the same arguments as in the above we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a\|_F &\leq \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right)^{-1} \right)' \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\
&\quad \times \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2} p_1^{3/2} p_2^{3/2} (p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{T^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2^{1/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2}} \right);
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|b\|_F &\leq \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&\quad \times \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2} p_1 p_2 (p_1 p_2)^{1/2} (p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{T^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2} p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2}} \right);
\end{aligned}$$

also, it follows by the same logic that $\|c\|_F$ is dominated by the other two terms;

$$\begin{aligned}
\|d\|_F &\leq \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F \\
&\quad \times \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right) \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2} p_2^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} p_2^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} (p_1 p_2 T^2)^{1/2} = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$\|e\|_F \leq \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}'_0 \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F + r_{p_1 p_2 T},$$

where $r_{p_1 p_2 T}$ is a dominated remainder, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}'_0 \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \sum_{\ell_1, \ell_2=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h_1, h_2=1}^{p_1} \sum_{u_1, u_2=1}^{p_2} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^{p_2} r_{\perp, h_1 \ell_1} r_{\perp, h_2 \ell_2} r_{0, \ell_1} r'_{0, \ell_2} c_{\perp, k_1 u_1} c_{\perp, k_2 u_2} c_{0, u_1} c_{0, u_2} e_{h_1 k_1, t} e_{h_2 k_2, t} e_{ij, t} e_{ij, s},
\end{aligned}$$

which can be shown to be $O_P(p_1^4 p_2^4 T)$; putting all together, it follows that

$$\|e\|_F = O_P(T^{1/2}).$$

Hence it follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F = O_P(T^{1/2}) + O_P\left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2}}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2}\right),$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_{b,3}\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F \\ &\quad \times \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{E}_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{T^{5/2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} + \frac{1}{p_1 \wedge p_2 T^{1/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and again by the same logic, it can be shown that $IV_{b,4} - IV_{b,7}$ are all dominated by $IV_{b,1} - IV_{b,3}$. By the same logic

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^7 V_i,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_1\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_2^2 p_1^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_2 T)^{1/2}} \right) T \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_2 T)^{1/2}} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_2\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right\|_F \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_1 T)^{1/2}} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_3\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \\
&\quad \times \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_2 p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} + \frac{1}{(p_1 \wedge 2 T)^{1/2}} \right) \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} + \frac{1}{(p_1 \wedge 2 T)^{1/2}} \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

again by Lemma 24; similarly, it can be shown that $V_4 - V_7$ are all dominated by $V_1 - V_3$. Finally we write

$$VI = \sum_{i=1}^7 VI_i.$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|VI_1\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0}\|_F^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2 \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_2 p_2 p_1 \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2} + \frac{1}{p_2 T} \right) T \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2} + \frac{1}{p_2 T} \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\|VI_2\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2^2} + \frac{1}{p_1 T} \right) \right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|VI_3\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F^2 \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right\|_F^2 \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_2 p_2 p_1 T \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_1 \wedge 2 T)^{1/2}} \right)^2 \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{(p_1 \wedge 2 T)^{1/2}} \right)^2 \right);
\end{aligned}$$

again, it can be shown by the same logic that $VI_4 - VI_7$ are all dominated by $VI_1 - VI_3$. The desired result now follows from the same logic as in the previous proofs. \square

Lemma 26. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then there exists a positive constant c_0 such that*

$$\lambda_j \left(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1} \right) = c_0 + o_P(1),$$

for all $j \leq h_{C_1}$, and

$$\lambda_j \left(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1} \right) = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T} \right),$$

for all $j > h_{C_1}$.

Proof. The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 25, *mutatis mutandis*. \square

Lemma 27. *We assume that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\left\| \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right\| = O_P(1), \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} \right\| = O_P(1).$$

Proof. The proof follows from Lemmas 25 and 26, in the same way as the proof of Lemma 15. \square

APPENDIX B. PROOFS

Henceforth, we will use the following notation: $\log(x)$ is the natural log of x ;

Proof of Theorem 1. We begin by studying the estimator of \mathbf{R}_1 . By construction, it holds that

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 = \mathbf{M}_{R_1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1},$$

where recall that, by Lemma 14, $\|\Lambda_{R_1}^{-1}\| = O_P(1)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (62) \quad \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \right)' \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \right)' \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \right)' \\ &= I + II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI'. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$(63) \quad \mathbf{H}_{R_1} = \frac{1}{p_1 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \frac{\mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1}{p_2} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} = \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1}{p_1} \right) \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1},$$

then it is immediate to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}_{R_1}\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right\|_F \|\Lambda_{R_1}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

having used the identification restriction $\mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 = p_2 \mathbf{I}_{h_{C_1}}$, and the facts that $\|\mathbf{R}\|_F = O(p_1^{1/2})$, $\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1\|_F = p_1^{1/2}$ by construction, and $\|\Lambda_{R_1}^{-1}\|_F = O_P(1)$, and (40) in Lemma 6. Further (using $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = h_{R_0} = h_{C_0} = 1$)

$$\|II\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1\|_F \|\Lambda_{R_1}^{-1}\|_F \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^2 \right) = O_P(1) \frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T},$$

having used Assumption 4, and Lemmas 8 and 14. Consider now

$$\|III\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{E}_t' \right) \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right),$$

by Lemma 10. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(T) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T} \right), \end{aligned}$$

having used Assumption 4 and Lemma 9. The same holds for $\|IV'\|_F$. By the same token

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T \right) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T} \right), \end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 4, the fact that $\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F = O_P \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T \right)$, and Lemma 14; and the same also holds for $\|V'\|_F$. Finally, using the same arguments as above, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|VI\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \Lambda_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2} \right) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and the same holds for $\|VI'\|_F$. Then, putting all together, it follows that

$$\left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T} \right).$$

We conclude the proof by showing that $\left\| (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P(1)$. Recall that, by construction, $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 = p_1 \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}}$; recall also the identification restriction $\mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1 = p_1 \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}}$; hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}} &= \frac{1}{p_1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \\ &= \mathbf{H}'_{R_1} \left(\frac{1}{p_1} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \mathbf{H}_{R_1} + \frac{1}{p_1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right) + \frac{1}{p_1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right)' \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{H}'_{R_1} \mathbf{H}_{R_1} + I + I' + II. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly

$$\|I\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1} \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1}\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T}\right);$$

the same holds for $\|I'\|_F$, and, by the same token, $\|II\|_F$ is dominated. Hence

$$(64) \quad \mathbf{H}'_{R_1} \mathbf{H}_{R_1} = \mathbf{I}_{h_{R_1}} + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T}\right).$$

Thus, as $\min\{p_1, p_2, T\} \rightarrow \infty$, \mathbf{H}_{R_1} is an orthogonal matrix, and therefore $(\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} = \mathbf{H}'_{R_1} + o_P(1)$. Now $\|\mathbf{H}_{R_1}\|_F = O_P(1)$ follows immediately.

We now turn to studying the estimator of \mathbf{C}_1 . Observing that

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 = \mathbf{M}_{C_1} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1},$$

and that, by Lemma 14, $\|\Lambda_{C_1}^{-1}\| = O_P(1)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}'_t \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} \right)' \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} \right)' \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} \right)' \\ &= I + II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI'. \end{aligned}$$

Letting

$$(65) \quad \mathbf{H}_{C_1} = \frac{1}{p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \frac{\mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1}{p_1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1} = \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1}{p_2} \right) \Lambda_{C_1}^{-1},$$

the proof proceeds as above, *mutatis mutandis*. □

Proof of Lemma 1. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t} &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{X}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}_1' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}_0' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\ &= I + II + III.\end{aligned}$$

We will use the decompositions

$$\mathbf{R}_1 = \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \pm \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \pm \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{C_1})^{-1}.$$

Consider I ; it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}I &= \frac{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1}{p_1} (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_1})^{-1} \frac{\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1}{p_2} - \frac{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} - \mathbf{R}_1)}{p_1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_1})^{-1} \frac{\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1}{p_2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1}{p_1} (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \frac{(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{C_1})^{-1} - \mathbf{C}_1)' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1}{p_2} + \frac{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} - \mathbf{R}_1)}{p_1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \frac{(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{C_1})^{-1} - \mathbf{C}_1)' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1}{p_2} \\ &= (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_1})^{-1} - I_a - I_b + I_c.\end{aligned}$$

By (39) in Lemma 6, it immediately follows that $\|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F = O_P(T^{1/2})$. Hence

$$\|I_a\|_F \leq \frac{\left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} - \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F}{p_1} \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F \left\| (\mathbf{H}'_{C_1})^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

having used Theorem 1; similarly

$$\|I_b\|_F \leq \frac{\left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 (\mathbf{H}_{C_1})^{-1} - \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F}{p_1} \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F \left\| (\mathbf{H}_{R_1})^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

by Theorem 1. By the same token, it is easy to see that $\|I_c\|_F = O_P(T^{-3/2})$. Further

$$\|II\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F = O_P(1),$$

which is a consequence of the fact that, by Assumption 2, $\|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F = O_P(1)$. Finally

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|III\|_F \\
& \leq \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} (\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1})' \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F + \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1})' \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F \\
& + \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} (\mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1})' \mathbf{E}_t (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}) \right\|_F + \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1})' \mathbf{E}_t (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}) \right\|_F \\
& \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \|\mathbf{R}_1' \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{H}_{R_1}\|_F \|\mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1}\|_F \|\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F \\
& + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \|\mathbf{R}_1' \mathbf{E}_t\|_F \|\mathbf{H}_{R_1}\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \|\mathbf{E}_t\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1}\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F \\
& = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2}}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This follows because

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \|\mathbf{R}_1' \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1\|_F^2 \\
& = E \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} r_i c_j e_{ij,t} \right)^2 \leq \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p_1} r_i^2 \right) \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p_2} c_i^2 \right) \sum_{i,i'=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j,j'=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{ij,t} e_{i'j',t})| \leq c_0 p_1 p_2,
\end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 3(ii)(e); also

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \|\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1\|_F^2 \\
& = E \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j e_{ij,t} \right)^2 \right) \leq \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p_2} c_i^2 \right) \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j,j'=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{ij,t} e_{i'j',t})| \leq c_0 p_1 p_2,
\end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 3(ii)(c); further, we have $E \|\mathbf{R}_1' \mathbf{E}_t\|_F^2 \leq c_0 p_1 p_2$, by Assumption 3(ii)(b) and the same arguments as above; and, finally, we also have $E \|\mathbf{E}_t\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} E(e_{ij,t}^2) \leq c_0 p_1 p_2$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. We study the estimator of \mathbf{R}_1 first. Some of the arguments in the proof are based on repeating some of the passages above, and we therefore omit them for brevity. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
(66) \quad \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right)' \\
&= I + II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI'.
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$I = \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{H}_{R_1}^\dagger,$$

having defined

$$\mathbf{H}_{R_1}^\dagger = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\ p_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\ p_2 \end{pmatrix}' \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \frac{\mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger}{p_1} \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1}.$$

Lemma 15 entails that $\left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\| = O_P(1)$; hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathbf{H}_{R_1}^\dagger \right\|_F &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\ p_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\ p_2 \end{pmatrix}' \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right\|_F \left\| \frac{\mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger}{p_1} \right\|_F \left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&\leq \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right\|_F^2 \left\| \frac{\mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1}{p_2} \right\|_F^2 \left\| \frac{\mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger}{p_1} \right\|_F \left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Further, recalling that $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = h_{R_0} = h_{C_0} = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|II\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t}^2 \right) \left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{3/2} p_2^2 O_P(T) = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} III &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \mathbf{H}_{C_1}' \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{E}_t' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right) \mathbf{H}_{C_1}' \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{E}_t' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right)' \mathbf{E}_t' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right)' \mathbf{E}_t' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\ &= III_a + III_b + III_b' + III_c. \end{aligned}$$

Under $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = h_{R_0} = h_{C_0} = 1$, \mathbf{H}_{C_1} is a random sign under our identification restrictions, so we will omit it; it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|III_a\|_F &\leq \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{E}_t' \right) \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger\|_F \left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &\leq p_1^{1/2} \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{E}_t' \right). \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{E}_t' \right) &\leq \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{E}_t') \right) \\ &\quad + \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{E}_t' - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}_1' \mathbf{E}_t')) \right). \end{aligned}$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \max_{1 \leq h \leq p_1} \sum_{k=1}^{p_1} \left| E \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j e_{hj,t} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j e_{kj,t} \right) \right| \\ & \leq c_0 \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \max_{1 \leq h \leq p_1} \sum_{k=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h,j=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{hj,t} e_{kj,t})| \leq c_1 \frac{1}{p_2 T}; \end{aligned}$$

also

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t)) \right\|_F \\ & = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{p_1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{h=1}^{p_2} c_h (e_{ih,t} - E(e_{ih,t})) \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{p_2} c_k (e_{ik,t} - E(e_{ik,t})) \right) \right) \right)^2 \Big)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & E \sum_{i,j=1}^{p_1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{h=1}^{p_2} c_h (e_{ih,t} - E(e_{ih,t})) \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{p_2} c_k (e_{ik,t} - E(e_{ik,t})) \right) \right)^2 \\ & \leq \left(\max_{1 \leq h \leq p_2} |c_h| \right)^4 \sum_{i,j=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T |\text{Cov}(e_{ih_1,t} e_{jh_2,t}, e_{ih_3,s} e_{jh_4,s})| \leq c_0 p_1^2 p_2^3 T, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T (\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t - E(\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t)) \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right).$$

Hence

$$\lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right) = O \left(\frac{1}{p_2 T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right),$$

which in turn entails that

$$\|III_a\|_F = O \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right).$$

Following the proof of Lemma C.5 in He et al. (2023), it can be shown that III_b and III_c are both dominated by III_a . We also have (recall that we are assuming $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$, and that therefore \mathbf{H}_{C_1} is a random

sign)

$$\begin{aligned}
IV &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} (\mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1})' \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \\
&= IV_a + IV_b.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider now

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \left| \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} c_h e_{ih,t} \right|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \left| \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} c_h e_{ih,t} \right|^2 \\
&= E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T c_h c_k \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,s} e_{ih,t} e_{ik,s} = \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T c_h c_k E(\mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,s}) E(e_{ih,t} e_{ik,s}) \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq h \leq p_2} c_h^2 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E(\mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,s})| |E(e_{ih,t} e_{ik,s})| \\
&\leq c_0 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E(\mathbf{F}_{1,t}^2) E(\mathbf{F}_{1,s}^2)|^{1/2} |E(e_{ih,t} e_{ik,s})| \\
&\leq c_1 T \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{h,k=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E(e_{ih,t} e_{ik,s})| \leq c_2 p_1 p_2 T^2,
\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$(67) \quad \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F = O_P \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T \right).$$

Hence it follows that

$$\|IV_a\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F \left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T} \right);$$

also

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|IV_b\|_F \\
&\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F \left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T^2} \right);
\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\|IV\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T^2}\right).$$

Similarly, it is not hard to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F^2 \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right\|_F \left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger\right)^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{3/2} p_2^2 T = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|VI\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1^\dagger\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}_t' \right\|_F \left\| \left(\Lambda_{R_1}^\dagger\right)^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &= O_P\left((p_1 p_2 T)^{1/2} + \frac{(p_1 T)^{1/2} p_2}{T} \right) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1 p_2 \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T^{5/2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The desired result now follows.

The proof of the other result follows from the same arguments as that of Lemma 12, upon defining

$$\mathbf{H}_{C_1}^\dagger = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t}' \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1}{p_1} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1}{p_1} \right)' \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \frac{\mathbf{C}_1' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1}{p_2} \left(\Lambda_{C_1}^\dagger\right)^{-1}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2. Some arguments are similar to the proof of Lemma 19, and we therefore omit them when possible. We begin by showing (14); by definition, it holds that

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 = \mathbf{M}_X^{R_1, \perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1},$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}
(68) \quad & \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \\
&= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
&= I + II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI'.
\end{aligned}$$

We begin by noting that, by Lemma 19, $\|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_{R_1} = O_P(1)$. Consider II first

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
&= \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\
&= II_a + II_b,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have defined

$$\mathbf{H}_{R_0} = \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \frac{\mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0}{p_2^2} \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \right) \frac{\mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0}{p_1} \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}$$

By similar arguments as in the above, it is easy to see that

$$\|\mathbf{H}_{R_0}\|_F \leq \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2 \right) \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0\|_F}{p_2} \right)^2 \frac{\|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F}{p_1} \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F = O_P(1).$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned}
\|II_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1 p_1^{1/2} T p_2 \frac{1}{T} = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

so that ultimately

$$II = \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} + O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T} \right).$$

We also note that Assumption 4(ii)(b) $\mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \neq 0$, together with Assumption 2(ii) entails that \mathbf{H}_{R_0} has full rank h_{R_1} . We now consider the other terms, starting from

$$I = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1},$$

having used (54) in the first passage, whence

$$\begin{aligned} \|I\|_F &\leq \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F^2 \right) \frac{\|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F^2 \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F^2}{p_2^2} \frac{\|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F}{p_1} \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= p_1^{1/2} O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2 T} \right) = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using (55)

$$\begin{aligned} (69) \quad \|III\|_F &= \left\| \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &= \left(O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \right) p_1^{1/2} \\ &= O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now study (explicitly considering the case $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$ for simplicity)

$$\begin{aligned} IV &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &= IV_a + IV_b, \end{aligned}$$

again having used (54). Hence, using the fact that (as can be verified with a similar logic as above)

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F = O_P \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2 T \right),$$

it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_a\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{T} \frac{\|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F}{p_1} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \frac{\|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F}{p_2^2} \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} p_2 T \frac{1}{p_2^{3/2} T} = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{T} \frac{\|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F}{p_1} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \frac{\|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F^2}{p_2^2} \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T \frac{1}{p_2^{3/2} T^2} = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 11, whence

$$\|IV\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T}\right).$$

By the same token

$$V = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1},$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_F &\leq \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right\|_F \frac{\|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F}{p_2^2} \frac{\|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F}{p_1} \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) p_1^{1/2} \frac{1}{p_2 T} = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} VI &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1} \\ &= VI_a + VI_b. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F^2 \\
&= E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h=1}^{p_2} c_{\perp,jh} e_{ih,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right)^2 \leq c_0 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h_1, h_2=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{ih_1,t} e_{ih_2,s})| |E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})| \\
&\leq c_0 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{h_1, h_2=1}^{p_2} |E(e_{ih_1,t} e_{ih_2,s})| \leq O(p_1 p_2^2 T),
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|VI_a\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_2 T^{1/2} = O_P\left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right);
\end{aligned}$$

also

$$\begin{aligned}
\|VI_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0\|_F \|\Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T^{3/2}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

having used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F^2 \\
&= E \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} e_{ij,t} \right)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E(\mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{0,s})| |E(e_{ij,t} e_{ij,s})| \\
&\leq c_0 \sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \sum_{t,s=1}^T |E(e_{ij,t} e_{ij,s})| \leq c_1 p_1 p_2 T.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|VI\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right).$$

The desired result now follows from putting everything together. As far as the invertibility of \mathbf{H}_{R_0} is concerned, it follows from similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1.

The proof of (15) is similar, upon noting

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 &= \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0^s \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1} \right)' \\
&= I + II + III + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI + VI'.
\end{aligned}$$

and defining

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{H}_{C_0} &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \frac{\mathbf{R}'_0 \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp}}{p_1} \frac{\mathbf{R}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_0}{p_1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right) \frac{\mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0}{p_2} \Lambda_{C_0}^{-1}, \\
\mathbf{H}_{R_0} &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}'_{0,t} \frac{\mathbf{C}'_0 \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}}{p_2} \frac{\mathbf{C}'_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_0}{p_2} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \right) \frac{\mathbf{R}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0}{p_1} \Lambda_{R_0}^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbf{D}} &= \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right)^{-1} \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}'_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right)^{-1}, \\
\hat{\mathbf{N}} &= \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right);
\end{aligned}$$

note that, by standard algebra

$$(70) \quad \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^2} \right),$$

and consider the decompositions

$$\mathbf{R}_0 = \mathbf{R}_0 \pm \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \mathbf{C}_0 \pm \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1}.$$

We are now ready to start the proof. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (71) \quad & \text{Vec } \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \\ &= \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \right) (\mathbf{C}_0 \otimes \mathbf{R}_0) \text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \\ & \quad + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \right) (\mathbf{C}_1 \otimes \mathbf{R}_1) \text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\ & \quad + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \right) \text{Vec } \mathbf{E}_t \\ &= I + II + III. \end{aligned}$$

Note

$$\begin{aligned} (72) \quad & I \\ &= \left[\left(\hat{\mathbf{D}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \right) \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right) \right) \right. \\ & \quad + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \right) \left(\left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \right) \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \otimes \left(\mathbf{R}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right) \right) \\ & \quad \left. + \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}}\right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{N}} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right)' \right) \left(\left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \otimes \left(\mathbf{R}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \right) \right) \right] \\ & \quad \times \text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \\ &= I_a + I_b + I_c + I_d. \end{aligned}$$

By standard algebraic manipulations

$$I_a = \text{Vec} \left((\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right).$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|I_b\|_F \\
&= \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \right\|_F \|\text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F \\
&= \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \right\|_F \|\text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F \\
&\leq \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right\|_F \sigma_{\max} \left[\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \left(\mathbf{C}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \left(\mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)^{-1} \right) \right] \\
&\quad \times \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \left(\mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \|\text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{0,t}\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^2} p_2^{1/2} p_2 \left[\left(O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1 T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_2^{1/2}}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \right) \right] p_1^{1/2} p_1 p_1^{1/2} \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 T} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

having used (70), Lemma 21 and Theorem 2. Similarly we can show that

$$\|I_c\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2 T} \right),$$

and by the same logic, it can be shown that $\|I_d\|_F$ is dominated. Further, using (54) and the similar result

$\mathbf{R}_1' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} = \mathbf{R}_1' \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_1 \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\
&= \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{C}_1 \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \right) \text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \\
&= \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \left(\left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0' \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{C}_1 \right) \otimes \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0' \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right) \mathbf{R}_1 \right) \right) \text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{1,t}
\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|II\|_F &\leq \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \\
&\quad \times \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp} - \mathbf{R}_{1,\perp} \right\|_F \|\text{Vec } \mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^2} p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} \frac{1}{T} T^{1/2} = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2 T^{3/2}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

having used (39) in Lemma 6 and Lemmas 17 and 18. Finally, using the same logic as in the above, it can be shown that (modulo some higher order terms)

$$\begin{aligned} \|III\|_F &\leq \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{D}} \right)^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{1,\perp}^s \right)' \mathbf{E}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}^s \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^2} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_1 p_2 = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then (17) follows from putting everything together. Equation (18) can be shown by noting that, using Minkowski's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}_{C_0}')^{-1} \right\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\left\| \tilde{I} \right\|_F^2 + \|II\|_F^2 + \|III\|_F^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where II and III are defined in (71), and $\tilde{I} = I_b + I_c + I_d$, with I_b , I_c and I_d defined in (72). The desired result can now be shown by applying the same logic as above. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Some arguments are similar to the proof of Lemma 2, and we therefore omit them when possible. We begin by showing (22); by definition, it holds that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 = \mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1},$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned}
(73) \quad & \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} + \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right)' \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right)' \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right)' \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\
&= I + II + III + III' + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI.
\end{aligned}$$

Upon letting

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} = \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \frac{\mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1}{p_2} \frac{\hat{\mathbf{C}}'_1 \mathbf{C}_1}{p_2} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{R}'_1 \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1}{p_1} \right) \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1},$$

the same logic as in the above yields that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\|_F = O_P(1)$. We now carry out the proof under $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = 1$ when possible, so that \mathbf{H}_{C_1} is a random sign. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right) \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\
&= II_a + II_b + II'_b + II_c,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|II_a\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1\|_F \|\tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1}\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right),$$

using/adapting (55). We now consider

$$\|II_b\|_F \leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right) \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F.$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right) \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,h=1}^{p_1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} (\hat{c}_j - c_j) e_{ij,t} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j e_{hj,t} \right) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i,h=1}^{p_1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} (\hat{c}_j - c_j) e_{ij,t} \right)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j e_{hj,t} \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i,h=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} (\hat{c}_j - c_j)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} e_{ij,t}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j e_{hj,s} \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F^2 \right) \sum_{i,h=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t,s=1}^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} e_{ij,t}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j e_{hj,s} \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right\|_F^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} e_{ij,t}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} c_j e_{hj,s} \right)^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

it is easy to see that

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right) \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F^2 = O_P(p_1^2 p_2^3),$$

whence it immediately follows that

$$\|II_b\|_F = O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^2} \right),$$

and the same holds for II'_b ; similarly, it is not hard to show that II_c is dominated by II_a and II_b . Turning to III ,

$$\begin{aligned} III &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1} \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} = III_a + III_b, \end{aligned}$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|III_a\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1\|_F \|\tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} (p_1 p_2 T^2)^{1/2} = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|III_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1}\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1\|_F \|\tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \frac{p_2^{1/2}}{T} p_1^{1/2} (p_1 p_2 T^2)^{1/2} = O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We now study

$$\begin{aligned} IV &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0})' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0}) \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 (\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1}) \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} + IV_d \\ &= IV_a + IV_b + IV_c + IV_d, \end{aligned}$$

where IV_d is a remainder which, by the same logic as above, can be shown to be dominated by $IV_a - IV_c$.

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_a\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1\|_F \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0}\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1\|_F \|\tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1}\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_2 T^2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F; \end{aligned}$$

noting that

$$\begin{aligned} (74) \quad \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F &\leq \|\mathbf{H}'_{C_1}\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{H}'_{C_1} \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F + \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{H}_{C_1})' \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \\ &= O_P\left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{T^{1/2}} p_1^{1/2} p_2\right), \end{aligned}$$

it now follows that

$$\|IV_a\|_F = O_P(1) \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{3/2} T^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2 T^{5/2}} + \frac{1}{T^3} \right).$$

Similarly, using again (74)

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_b\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{H}_{R_0}^{-1} \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \\ &\quad \times \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \widetilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &= O_P(1) \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2 T^2} + \frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^3} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{3/2} T^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2 T^{5/2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|IV_c\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{C}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \widetilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{E}'_t \right\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_2 T^2} T^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{(p_1 \wedge 2T)^{1/2}} \right) \left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} + \frac{p_1^{1/2} p_2}{T} \right) \end{aligned}$$

by the same logic as above. We now study

$$\begin{aligned} V' &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right)' \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \widetilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right) \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \widetilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{R}_0 \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{C}'_0 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1' \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \widetilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} + V_d \\ &= V_a + V_b + V_c + V_d, \end{aligned}$$

where V_d is a remainder which, by the same logic as above, can be shown to be dominated by $V_a - V_c$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|V_a\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F^2 \left\| \mathbf{C}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_0 - \mathbf{C}_0 \mathbf{H}_{C_0} \right\|_F \\ &\quad \times \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right\|_F \left\| \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \widetilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \\ &= p_1^{1/2} O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_2 p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) T \\ &= O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_b\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{H}_{R_0} \right\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F^2 \\
&\quad \times \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_2 p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) T \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1 p_2} + \frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and, using Lemma 24

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_c\|_F &= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} \|\mathbf{R}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{R}_0\|_F \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{C}_1\|_F \|\mathbf{C}_0\|_F \\
&\quad \times \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} - (\mathbf{H}_{R_0})^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{0,t} (\mathbf{H}'_{C_0})^{-1} \right) \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T^2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_1^{1/2} p_2 p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (18)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|VI\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right\|_F^2 \right) \left\| \hat{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F^2 \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_1}^{-1} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right)^2 p_2 p_1^{1/2} \\
&= O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2 T} \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right)^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which is dominated. The desired result now follows from putting all together; finally, the invertibility of

$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}$ can be shown in a similar way as in the above.

As far as (23) is concerned, recall

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 = \mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{C_1} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 &= \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} + \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}'_t \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{E}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{E}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} + \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{E}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{E}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{E}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right) \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{C}_1 \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right) \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} \right)' \\
&+ \frac{1}{p_1^2 p_2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right)' \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right) \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1} \\
&= I + II + III + III' + IV + IV' + V + V' + VI.
\end{aligned}$$

Upon defining

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} = \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}'_1 \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1 \\ p_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{R}}_1' \mathbf{R}_1 \\ p_1 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}'_1 \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\ p_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \tilde{\Lambda}_{C_1}^{-1},$$

the proof of the theorem is the same as above, and we therefore omit it. \square

Proof of Theorem 5. Recall that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t} = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1' \hat{\mathbf{X}}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1.$$

We will use the decompositions

$$(75) \quad \mathbf{R}_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right)^{-1} - \left(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right)^{-1},$$

$$(76) \quad \mathbf{C}_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} \right)^{-1} - \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} \right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} \right)^{-1}.$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t} &= \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}'_{C_1}\right)^{-1} - \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}'_1 \left(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}'_1 \mathbf{R}_1 \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}\right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}\right)^{-1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}'_1 \left(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \mathbf{C}'_1 \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}\right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}\right)^{-1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}'_1 \left(\mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0\right) \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \\
&= \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{F}_{1,t} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}'_{C_1}\right)^{-1} + I + II + III + IV + V.
\end{aligned}$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|I\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right\|_F \left\| \left(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right)^{-1} \right\|_F \|\mathbf{C}\|_F \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \|\mathbf{F}_{1,t}\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} p_1^{1/2} \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T} + \frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T^2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T} + \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \right) p_2^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2} \\
&= O_P(1) \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{p_1 T^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T} \right);
\end{aligned}$$

by the same token, it can be shown that

$$\|II\|_F = O_P(1) \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{p_2 T^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T} \right),$$

and $\|III\|_F$ is clearly dominated by $\|I\|_F$ and $\|II\|_F$. Using the convention $h_{R_1} = h_{C_1} = h_{R_0} = h_{C_0} = 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
IV &= \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}'_{R_1} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right)' \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}'_{R_1} \mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}\right) + \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1}\right)' \mathbf{E}_t \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 - \mathbf{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1}\right) \\
&= IV_a + IV_b + IV_c + IV_d.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above we showed that $\|\mathbf{R}'_1 \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1\|_F = O_p\left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2}\right)$ and $\|\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1\|_F = O_p\left(p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2}\right)$; hence it follows that

$$\|IV_a\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^{1/2}}\right),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|IV_b\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_1} \right\|_F \|\mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_1\|_F \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{C_1} \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} p_1^{1/2} \left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T} + \frac{p_1^{1/2}}{T^2} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T} + \frac{1}{T^{3/2}} \right) (p_1 p_2)^{1/2} \\
&= O_P(1) \left(\frac{1}{p_2^{1/2} T} + \frac{1}{T^2} + \frac{1}{p_1 T} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and likewise

$$\|IV_c\|_F = O_P(1) \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T} + \frac{1}{T^2} + \frac{1}{p_2 T} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right).$$

Finally, it is not hard to see that IV_d is dominated by $IV_a - IV_c$. Finally, after some algebra

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V\|_F &\leq \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_1 \right\|_F \left\| \mathbf{R}_0 \mathbf{F}_{0,t} \mathbf{C}'_0 - \hat{\mathbf{R}}_0 \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{0,t} \hat{\mathbf{C}}'_0 \right\|_F \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1 \right\|_F \\
&= O_P(1) \left(\frac{1}{(p_1 p_2)^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{1/2}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The final result follows from putting all together. The proof of (25) is similar to that of (18), and we omit it to save space. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Consider (25). The result follows immediately upon considering the term

$$\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{1,\perp}^s \left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\perp}^s \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_0}^{-1},$$

in the expansion of $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0}$, which can be derived along the same lines as (68). In particular, the term

$$\frac{1}{p_1 p_2^2 T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{E}_t \mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}^s \left(\mathbf{C}_{1,\perp}^s \right)' \mathbf{E}'_t \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 \tilde{\Lambda}_{R_0}^{-1},$$

is of order $O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_1 p_2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{p_1^{1/2}}{p_2^{1/2} T^{1/2}}\right)$; again, this can be shown following exactly the proof of (69). Since this is the dominant rate in $\left\| \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_0 - \mathbf{R}_0 \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{R_0} \right\|_F$, the desired result follows. The same arguments yield also (26). \square

Proof of Lemma 4. The method of proof is the same for all theorems and lemmas, and it is based on an argument in Bai (2003) - see in particular Footnote 5 on p. 143. Consider the random variable \mathcal{A} , with $\mathcal{A} = 1$ if the relevant result holds, and $\mathcal{A} = 0$ otherwise; and the random variable \mathcal{B} , with $\mathcal{B} = 1$ if $\tilde{h}_{R_1} = h_{R_1}$, and $\tilde{h}_{C_1} = h_{C_1}$, and $\tilde{h}_{R_0} = h_{R_0}$, and $\tilde{h}_{C_0} = h_{C_0}$, and $\mathcal{B} = 0$ otherwise. Then we have

$$P(\{\mathcal{A} = 1\}) = P(\{\mathcal{A} = 1\} \cap \{\mathcal{B} = 1\}) + P(\{\mathcal{A} = 1\} \cap \{\mathcal{B} = 0\}).$$

Note also that

$$P(\{\mathcal{A} = 1\} \cap \{\mathcal{B} = 0\}) \leq P(\{\mathcal{B} = 0\}) = o(1),$$

under the assumption that $\tilde{h}_{R_1} = h_{R_1} + o_P(1)$, $\tilde{h}_{C_1} = h_{C_1} + o_P(1)$, $\tilde{h}_{R_0} = h_{R_0} + o_P(1)$, $\tilde{h}_{C_0} = h_{C_0} + o_P(1)$, which also entails that $P(\{\mathcal{B} = 1\}) \rightarrow 1$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\{\mathcal{A} = 1\}) &= P(\{\mathcal{A} = 1\} \cap \{\mathcal{B} = 1\}) + o(1) \\ &= P(\{\mathcal{A} = 1\} | \{\mathcal{B} = 1\}) P(\{\mathcal{B} = 1\}) + o(1) \\ &= P(\{\mathcal{A} = 1\} | \{\mathcal{B} = 1\}) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the desired result. \square

Proof of Theorem 7. We only show that $\tilde{h}_{R_1} = h_{R_1} + o_P(1)$; the other results follow from the same arguments. Recall that, by Lemma 25,

$$(77) \quad \lambda_j \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right) = c_0 + o_P(1),$$

for all $j \leq h_{R_1}$, where $c_0 > 0$; and, also

$$(78) \quad \lambda_j \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right) = O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} T^{3/2}} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_2 T} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{T^2} \right) + O_P \left(\frac{1}{p_1^{1/2} p_2^{1/2} T} \right),$$

for all $j > h_{R_1}$. Hence, by elementary arguments, (77) entails that

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq h_{R_1} - 1} \frac{\lambda_j \left(\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1 \diamond} \right)}{\lambda_{j+1} \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right) + \tilde{c}_{R_1} \delta_{R, p_1, p_2, T}^k} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq h_{R_1} - 1} \frac{\lambda_j \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right)}{\lambda_{j+1} \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right)} = O_P(1).$$

Similarly, using (78) and the definition of $\tilde{\delta}_{R, p_1, p_2, T}^k$

$$\max_{h_{R_1} + 1 \leq j \leq h_{\max}} \frac{\lambda_j \left(\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1 \diamond} \right)}{\lambda_{j+1} \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right) + \tilde{c}_{R_1} \delta_{R, p_1, p_2, T}^k} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq h_{R_1} - 1} \frac{\lambda_j \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right)}{\tilde{c}_{R_1} \delta_{R, p_1, p_2, T}^k} = O_P(1).$$

Finally, combining (77) and (78), as $\min\{p_1, p_2, T\} \rightarrow \infty$ we have that, for some $0 < c_0 < \infty$

$$P \left(\frac{\lambda_{h_{R_1}} \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right)}{\lambda_{h_{R_1} + 1} \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right) + \tilde{c}_{R_1} \delta_{R, p_1, p_2, T}^k} \geq c_0 \left(\delta_{R, p_1, p_2, T}^k \right)^{-1} \lambda_{h_{R_1}} \left(\overset{\circ}{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1} \right) \right) = 1.$$

The desired result follows from noting that, by (77)

$$\lim_{\min\{p_1, p_2, T\} \rightarrow \infty} \left(\delta_{R, p_1, p_2, T}^k \right)^{-1} \lambda_{h_{R_1}} \left(\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1 \diamond} \right) = \infty.$$

When using the mock eigenvalue, note that if $h_{R_1} > 0$

$$\frac{\lambda_0(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1})}{\lambda_1(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}) + \tilde{c}_{R_1} \delta_{R,p_1,p_2,T}^k} \leq \frac{\lambda_0(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1})}{\lambda_1(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1})} = o_P(1),$$

by the definition of $\lambda_0(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1})$; conversely, if $h_{R_1} = 0$, then by the same token as above

$$P \left(\frac{\lambda_0(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1})}{\lambda_1(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}) + \tilde{c}_{R_1} \delta_{R,p_1,p_2,T}^k} \geq c_0 (\delta_{R,p_1,p_2,T}^k)^{-1} \lambda_0(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1}) \right) = 1.$$

for some $0 < c_0 < \infty$, and, by the construction of $\lambda_{h_{R_1}}(\mathring{\mathbf{M}}_{R_1})$

$$\lim_{\min\{p_1,p_2,T\} \rightarrow \infty} (\delta_{R,p_1,p_2,T}^k)^{-1} \lambda_0(\mathbf{M}_X^{R_1 \diamond}) = \infty,$$

whence the desired result again follows. □




FIGURE C.1. Boxplots of the ratio $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flat}}/\mathcal{D}_{\text{proj}}$ between the initial flattened and the refined projected estimators for \mathbf{R}_1 (left) and \mathbf{C}_1 (right) against p_1 .




FIGURE C.2. Boxplots of the ratio $\mathcal{D}_{\text{flat}}/\mathcal{D}_{\text{proj}}$ between the initial flattened and the refined projected estimators for \mathbf{R}_0 (left) and \mathbf{C}_0 (right) against T .

APPENDIX C. ADDITIONAL MONTE CARLO RESULTS

In this section we report extended simulation studies that could not fit in the main article due to space constraints.




FIGURE C.3. Case 1.2: estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{C}_1 , \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 for varying series length T and row dimension p_1 . Also, $p_2 = 20$. Triangles with dashed lines indicate the initial “flattened” estimator, circles with full lines indicate the refined projected estimator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NJ USA

Email address: rongchen@stat.rutgers.edu

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE ECONOMICHE E STATISTICHE, UNIVERSITÀ DI UDINE, ITALY

Email address: simone.giannerini@uniud.it

FREE UNIVERSITY OF BOZEN-BOLZANO, FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT, BOLZANO, ITALY

Email address: greta.goracci@unibz.it

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER BUSINESS SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY ROAD, LEICESTER LE1 7RH, UK, AND DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT, UNIVERSITY OF PAVIA, 27100 PAVIA, ITALY

Email address: lt285@leicester.ac.uk




FIGURE C.4. Case 2.1: estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{C}_1 , \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 for varying series length T and row dimension p_1 . Also, $p_2 = 20$. Triangles with dashed lines indicate the initial “flattened” estimator, circles with full lines indicate the refined projected estimator.




FIGURE C.5. Case 2.2: estimation of $\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{C}_0$ for varying series length T and row dimension p_1 . Also, $p_2 = 20$. Triangles with dashed lines indicate the initial “flattened” estimator, circles with full lines indicate the refined projected estimator.




FIGURE C.6. Case 3.1: estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{C}_1 , \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 for varying series length T and row dimension p_1 . Also, $p_2 = 20$. Triangles with dashed lines indicate the initial “flattened” estimator, circles with full lines indicate the refined projected estimator.




FIGURE C.7. Case 3.2: estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{C}_1 , \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 for varying series length T and row dimension p_1 . Also, $p_2 = 20$. Triangles with dashed lines indicate the initial “flattened” estimator, circles with full lines indicate the refined projected estimator.




FIGURE C.8. Case 4.1: estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{C}_1 , \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 for varying series length T and row dimension p_1 . Also, $p_2 = 20$. Triangles with dashed lines indicate the initial “flattened” estimator, circles with full lines indicate the refined projected estimator.




FIGURE C.9. Case 4.2: estimation of \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{C}_1 , \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathbf{C}_0 for varying series length T and row dimension p_1 . Also, $p_2 = 20$. Triangles with dashed lines indicate the initial “flattened” estimator, circles with full lines indicate the refined projected estimator.




FIGURE C.10. Boxplots of the percentages of correct estimation of the number of factors for the 4 criteria and varying p_1 and sample size T . The percentages for the 8 cases and the 4 different parameters are aggregated in a single boxplot.




FIGURE C.11. Boxplots of the differences of percentages of correct estimation of the number of factors for the iterative criteria w.r.t. the static criterion. Positive values indicate that the iterative version is superior w.r.t. the static one. The percentages for the 8 cases and the 4 different parameters are aggregated in a single boxplot.