

SIMPLE INFERENCE ON A SIMPLEX-VALUED WEIGHT

Nathan Canen and Kyungchul Song

University of Warwick & CEPR and University of British Columbia

ABSTRACT. In many applications, the parameter of interest involves a simplex-valued weight which is identified as a solution to an optimization problem. Examples include synthetic control methods with group-level weights and various methods of model averaging and forecast combination. The simplex constraint on the weight poses a challenge in statistical inference due to the constraint potentially binding. In this paper, we propose a simple method of constructing a confidence set for the weight and prove that the method is asymptotically uniformly valid. The procedure does not require tuning parameters or simulations to compute critical values. The confidence set accommodates both the cases of point-identification or set-identification of the weight. We illustrate the method with an empirical example.

KEY WORDS: Simplex-Valued Weight; Synthetic Control; Model Averaging; Forecast Combination; Uniform Asymptotic Validity

JEL CLASSIFICATION: C30, C54

Date: January 28, 2025.

We thank Bruce Hansen, Frank Schorfheide and Xiaoxia Shi for conversations that inspired this paper. We also thank participants in a seminar at University College London for valuable comments. All errors are ours. Song acknowledges that this research was supported by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Corresponding Address: Kyungchul Song, Vancouver School of Economics, University of British Columbia, 6000 Iona Drive, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1L4, Canada, kysong@mail.ubc.ca.

1. Introduction

We consider the following problem. Suppose that the population weight $w_0 \in \Delta_{K-1}$ in the simplex $\Delta_{K-1} = \{w \in \mathbf{R}^K : w \geq 0, w' \mathbf{1} = 1\}$ is defined as a solution to the following optimization problem:

$$(1) \quad w_0 \in \underset{w \in \Delta_{K-1}}{\operatorname{argmin}} Q(w),$$

where $Q(w)$ is the population objective function that is convex and differentiable in $w \in \mathbf{R}^K$. Our focus is on constructing a $(1 - \alpha)$ -level confidence set $C_{1-\alpha}$ for w_0 that is uniformly asymptotically valid.

This inference problem arises in many contexts of applications. For example, in the causal inference literature, various methods of synthetic control design choose a weight as a solution to (1) (see [Abadie \(2021\)](#) for a survey of this literature). Meanwhile, in the literature of forecast combinations, the final forecast is constructed as a weighted average of forecasts from different methods or experts. (See [Timmermann \(2006\)](#).) While not in consensus, the use of simplex-constrained weight has been part of the main approaches considered in this literature. The least squares model averaging proposed by [Hansen \(2007\)](#) also falls into this framework. In particular, [Hansen \(2007\)](#) proposed minimizing the Mallows metric to obtain the optimal weight. The population version of the minimization problem can be written as the optimization problem in (1).

The main challenge in the theory of statistical inference on the weight is that the parameter is potentially on the boundary, as w_0 can fall on an edge or a vertex of the simplex Δ_{K-1} . Hence, even if w_0 is point-identified and \sqrt{n} -consistently estimable, it is far from obvious how to construct a pivotal test statistic whose limiting distribution is invariant uniformly over the probabilities in the model.

Despite the challenge, there are methods which can be applied to develop an asymptotic inference procedure. For example, we may build a quadratic approximation of the objective function to derive the limiting distribution that depends on the localization parameter ([Geyer \(1994\)](#), [Andrews \(1999\)](#) and [Moon and Schorfheide \(2009\)](#)). Another method is to adapt the inference based on the quasi-likelihood ratio approach in [Chen, Christensen, and Tamer \(2018\)](#) to this setting. Alternatively, we could employ the projection method of [Fang and Seo \(2021\)](#). These methods require bootstrapping the distribution of or simulating the limiting distribution of a test statistic to obtain critical values. Since such a test is inverted to construct a confidence set for w_0 , the bootstrap-based or simulation-based critical values can be computationally intensive in practice.

In this paper, we propose a simple method of constructing a confidence set for the simplex-valued weight which is free of tuning parameters and does not require simulations to compute critical values. The method is shown to produce confidence sets that are asymptotically valid uniformly over the behavior of the population weight. We provide simulation results and an empirical application to demonstrate the merits of our method. Our proposal is based on the main idea of [Mohamad, van Zwet, Cator, and Goeman \(2020\)](#) who proposed an adaptive inference method on parameters under inequality restrictions, assuming that the estimators are exactly normally distributed with a shift. We develop the inference method by adapting their proposal to our setting of asymptotic inference. This adaptation is nontrivial, especially when we verify the uniform asymptotic validity of the critical values. Our approach is also related to [Cox and Shi \(2022\)](#). They considered a general moment inequality model that involves a nuisance parameter additively, and proposed novel asymptotic inference methods that use a χ^2 distribution with data-dependent degrees of freedom like our proposal. However, as we explain later in the paper, their setting does not subsume ours. The mathematical proofs here are entirely new.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we introduce a basic set-up with examples, and present our main proposal to construct a confidence set for a simplex-valued weight. In Section 3, we provide our main result of uniform asymptotic validity of the confidence set, and Monte Carlo simulations that study the finite sample properties of our statistical procedure. An empirical application is presented in Section 4 as an illustration. In Section 5, we conclude. Mathematical proofs of the results in this paper are found in the appendix.

2. A Simple Confidence Set for a Simplex-Valued Weight

2.1. A Simplex-Valued Weight

Let us formally introduce the problem. Suppose that H_p is a $K \times K$ matrix and h_p is a K -dimensional vector which potentially depends on the population distribution P . Let Δ_{K-1} denote the simplex in \mathbf{R}^K , i.e., $\Delta_{K-1} = \{w \in \mathbf{R}^K : w \geq 0, w' \mathbf{1} = 1\}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the $K \times 1$ vector of ones. (Here, the inequality between two vectors should be understood as the set of pointwise inequalities between the corresponding entries.)

Given a map $Q_p : \mathbf{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, we define the argmin set of weights, \mathbb{W}_p , as follows:

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{W}_p = \left\{ w \in \Delta_{K-1} : Q_p(w) = \inf_{\tilde{w} \in \Delta_{K-1}} Q_p(\tilde{w}) \right\}.$$

We assume that Q_p is convex and differentiable on \mathbf{R}^K and there exists a true weight w_0 in the set \mathbb{W}_p .

Example 2.1 (Synthetic Control with Group-Level Weights). Suppose that we have $K+1$ groups where each group j consists of n_j individual units which are observed over T periods (e.g. [Kreif, Grieve, Hangartner, Turner, Nikolova, and Sutton \(2016\)](#)). The units in group 0 are treated at $T+1$, but all the other units untreated. We denote each individual i 's group membership as $G_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$. Here, we assume that n_j is large but K is small.

The synthetic control approach suggests constructing a counterfactual untreated group average outcome for group 0 for time t using the outcomes from the other K units:

$$\sum_{j=1}^K \hat{w}_j \hat{\mu}_{j,t},$$

where $\hat{w} = [\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_K]'$ is a weight vector, and $\hat{\mu}_{j,t} = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{i:G_i=j} Y_{i,t}$.¹ Then, the synthetic control method takes \hat{w} to be the solution from the following optimization problem:

$$\hat{w} = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \Delta_{K-1}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{\mu}_{0,t} - \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \hat{\mu}_{k,t} \right)^2.$$

Now, we derive the population version of the optimization problem. First, define $\mu_{t,k} = \mathbf{E}[Y_{i,t} \mid G_i = k]$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$, and let H_p be the $K \times K$ matrix whose (j, k) -th entry is given by $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mu_{t,j} \mu_{t,k}$ and h_p be the K -dimensional vector whose k -th entry is given by $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mu_{t,0} \mu_{t,k}$. We take

$$Q_p(w) = \frac{1}{2} w' H_p w - w' h_p,$$

and formulate the population optimization problem as follows:

$$(3) \quad w_0 = \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \Delta_{K-1}} Q_p(w).$$

If $Q_p(w_0) = 0$ for some $w_0 \in \Delta_{K-1}$ and H_p is invertible, we have

$$w_0 = H_p^{-1} h_p.$$

Hence, the restriction $Q_p(w_0) = 0$ in this case is tantamount to assuming that the regression-based weight $w_0 = H_p^{-1} h_p$ falls automatically into the simplex Δ_{K-1} . However, this restriction can be violated in practice, yielding a weight based on extrapolation. (See [Abadie and L'Hour \(2021\)](#).) For our procedure, we do not assume that $Q_p(w_0) = 0$ or H_p is invertible. ■

¹This setting of a synthetic control method is different from more frequently studied settings where the weights are assigned at the individual level and the outcome of each individual is assumed to follow a linear factor model and the pre-treatment fit is on the factor loadings and time-invariant constants (see [Ferman and Pinto \(2021\)](#)). These settings used in the literature also assume the availability of long time series observations, unlike the setting considered in this example.

Example 2.2 (Distributional Synthetic Control). [Gunsilius \(2023\)](#) proposed a method of using the synthetic control to construct the counterfactual distribution of potential outcomes. The weight w_0 is identified as a solution to the following optimization problem:

$$w_0 \in \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \Delta_{K-1}} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^K F_j^{-1}(q) w_j - F_0^{-1}(q) \right)^2 dq,$$

where $F_j^{-1}(q)$ denotes the q -th quantile of the outcome distribution in population $j = 1, \dots, K$ in the pool of untreated units and $F_0^{-1}(q)$ denotes the q -th quantile of the outcome distribution in the treated population.

Let $U(q)$ be the $K \times K$ matrix whose (j, k) -th entry is given by $F_j^{-1}(q)F_k^{-1}(q)$ and $u_p(q)$ the K -dimensional vector whose k -th entry is given by $F_k^{-1}(q)F_0^{-1}(q)$. Define

$$H_p = \int_{\mathbf{R}} U_p(q) dq \text{ and } h_p = \int_{\mathbf{R}} u_p(q) dq.$$

Now, we can reformulate the optimization problem as in (3) with $Q_p(w) = \frac{1}{2}w'H_p w - w'h_p$. ■

Example 2.3 (Forecast Combination). In the literature of forecast combination, the final forecast is constructed as a weighted average of multiple forecasts:

$$\hat{w} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \Delta_{K-1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (y_t - \hat{y}'_t w)' (y_t - \hat{y}'_t w),$$

where y_t is the target outcome and \hat{y}'_t is the K dimensional vector of outcomes used for constructing the forecast at time t . (See [Timmermann \(2006\)](#) for a review of this literature.) The population version of this optimization problem is given by

$$w_0 \in \operatorname{argmin}_{w \in \Delta_{K-1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbf{E}_p [(y_t - \mathbf{y}'_t w)' (y_t - \mathbf{y}'_t w)],$$

where \mathbf{y}_t is the K dimensional vector of population outcomes corresponding to \hat{y}'_t . Then, we can rewrite the optimization problem as the minimization of $Q_p(w) = \frac{1}{2}w'H_p w - w'h_p$ over $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$, where

$$H_p = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbf{E}_p [\mathbf{y}_t \mathbf{y}'_t] \text{ and } h_p = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbf{E}_p [y_t \mathbf{y}_t].$$

The value of restricting the weight to the simplex has been debated in the literature and defended on the ground that it reduces the variability of the resulting forecast. (See [Timmermann \(2006\)](#).) Despite the popular use of forecast combinations, the theory of statistical inference on the weighted forecasts appears under-developed (see [Xia, Hyndman, Li, and Kang \(2023\)](#), p.1539.) ■

Example 2.4 (Least Squares Model Averaging). Hansen (2007) proposed a model averaging estimator using the Mallows metric. Let (y_i, x_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$, be a random sample, where $y_i \in \mathbf{R}$ but $x_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots)$ is countably infinite. The model for the outcome y_i is given by

$$y_i = \mu_i + e_i,$$

where

$$\mu_i = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} a_{\ell} x_{i\ell},$$

$\mathbf{E}[e_i | x_i] = 0$, and a_{ℓ} 's are constants. Let $0 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 < \dots < \ell_K$, where ℓ_k 's are integers. For each $k = 1, \dots, K$, we let $\mathbf{a}_k = [a_1, \dots, a_{\ell_k}]'$ be the ℓ_k dimensional vector of the first ℓ_k coefficients. The focus here is on the model average estimator of \mathbf{a}_K . Let $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k$ be the least squares estimator of \mathbf{a}_k from projecting $Y = [y_1, \dots, y_n]'$ onto the column space of X_k , where X_k denotes the $n \times \ell_k$ matrix whose (i, j) -th entry is given by x_{ij} . The model averaging estimator $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_K$ of \mathbf{a}_K takes the following form:

$$\bar{\mathbf{a}}_K = \hat{A}w,$$

where \hat{A} is the $\ell_K \times K$ matrix whose k -th column vector has the first ℓ_k dimensional subvector equal to $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k$ and the rest of its entries as zeros. In determining the weight $w = [w_1, \dots, w_K]'$, Hansen (2007) proposed to minimize the Mallows metric:

$$\hat{w} \in \underset{w \in \Delta_{K-1}}{\operatorname{argmin}} (Y - X_K \bar{\mathbf{a}}_K)' (Y - X_K \bar{\mathbf{a}}_K) + 2\sigma^2 w' \ell,$$

where $\ell = [\ell_1, \dots, \ell_K]'$, and showed its asymptotic optimality property. Note that we can write

$$\hat{w} \in \underset{w \in \Delta_{K-1}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{2} w' \hat{H} w - w' \hat{h},$$

where $\hat{H} = \frac{1}{n} \hat{A}' (X_K' X_K) \hat{A}$ and $\hat{h} = \frac{1}{n} (\hat{A}' X_K' Y - \sigma^2 \ell)$. Thus, for inference, the population (pseudo-true) weight w_0 can be viewed as the solution to the optimization problem (3), where

$$H_p = \frac{1}{n} A_p' \mathbf{E}_p [X_K' X_K] A_p \text{ and } h_p = \frac{1}{n} (A_p' \mathbf{E}_p [X_K' Y] - \sigma^2 \ell),$$

and A_p is the $\ell_K \times K$ matrix whose k -th column vector consists of the first ℓ_k dimensional subvector which is equal to $(\mathbf{E}_p [X_K' X_k])^{-1} \mathbf{E}_p [X_k' Y]$ and the rest of its entries as zeros. ■

2.2. A Simple Confidence Set

Suppose that the true weight w_0 belongs to \mathbb{W}_p . Our goal is to construct a confidence set for w_0 that is asymptotically uniformly valid over the class of population distributions P under

consideration. We will give a set of conditions later. For this section, we present the procedure of constructing the confidence set.

First, define

$$\varphi_P(w) = \frac{\partial Q_P(w)}{\partial w},$$

and take $\hat{\varphi}(w)$ as an estimator of $\varphi_P(w)$ such that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\varphi}(w) - \varphi_P(w)) \rightarrow_d N(0, V_P(w)),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where Φ is the CDF of $N(0, 1)$. Suppose that we have a consistent estimator of $V_P(w)$, denoted by $\hat{V}(w)$.

We consider the $K \times K$ orthogonal matrix $B = [\mathbf{1}/\sqrt{K}, B_2]$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the K dimensional column vector of ones and B_2 is the $K \times (K - 1)$ matrix consisting of orthonormal column vectors that are orthogonal to $\mathbf{1}$.² Let

$$\hat{f}(w) = B_2' \hat{\varphi}(w),$$

where I_K denotes the $K \times K$ identity matrix. Define

$$\hat{\Omega}(w) = B_2' \hat{V}(w) B_2.$$

Using $\hat{\varphi}$ and $\hat{\Omega}$ only, we can construct a confidence set for w_0 as follows.

PROCEDURE 1: CONFIDENCE SET FOR w_0

Input: the matrix B_2 , $\hat{f}(w)$ and $\hat{\Omega}(w)$, $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$.

for $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$,

(Step 1) solve

$$\hat{\lambda}(w) \in \underset{\lambda}{\operatorname{argmin}} (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \lambda)' \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \lambda),$$

under the constraints: $w' \lambda = 0$ and $\lambda \geq 0$,

(Step 2) let $\hat{d}(w)$ be the number of zeros in the vector $B_2 \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \hat{\lambda}(w))$,

(Step 3) let $\hat{c}_{1-\alpha}(w)$ be the $1 - \alpha$ percentile of the $\chi_{\hat{k}(w)}^2$ distribution, where

$$\hat{k}(w) = \max \{K - 1 - \hat{d}(w), 1\}.$$

end for.

²The computation of B_2 is straightforward. First note that $B_2' B_2 = I_{K-1}$. Hence, $B_2 B_2' = I_K - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'/K$, i.e., the projection matrix projecting onto the orthogonal complement of the span of $\mathbf{1}$. To obtain B_2 , we obtain a spectral decomposition: $I_K - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'/K = UDU'$. From this, we set B_2 to be the $K \times (K - 1)$ matrix after removing the eigenvector from U that corresponds to the zero diagonal element of D .

Output: confidence set:

$$(4) \quad C_{1-\alpha} = \{w \in \Delta_{K-1} : T(w) \leq \hat{c}_{1-\alpha}(w)\},$$

where $T(w) = n(\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \hat{\lambda}(w))' \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \hat{\lambda}(w))$.

The construction of the confidence set $C_{1-\alpha}$ is simple, involving no simulations or a sequence of tuning parameters that require a judicious choice in finite samples.

The computation of $V_p(w)$ and its consistent estimation can be done in a standard manner. For example, consider the case where

$$Q_p(w) = \frac{1}{2} w' H_p w - w' h_p, \text{ and } \hat{Q}(w) = \frac{1}{2} w' \hat{H} w - w' \hat{h}.$$

Then, we have

$$\hat{\varphi}(w) = \hat{H} w - \hat{h} \text{ and } \varphi_p(w) = H_p w - h_p.$$

As for \hat{H} and \hat{h} , suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\hat{H} - H_p) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \Psi_{i,H} + o_p(1), \text{ and} \\ \sqrt{n}(\hat{h} - h_p) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{i,h} + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Psi_{i,H}$ and $\psi_{i,h}$ are influence functions that are i.i.d. across i 's. Then, we can find that

$$(5) \quad V_p(w) = \mathbf{E}_p [\psi_i(w) \psi_i(w)'],$$

where $\psi_i(w) = \Psi_{i,H} w - \psi_{i,h}$. Thus, a consistent estimator $\hat{V}(w)$ of $V_p(w)$ is obtained as follows:

$$(6) \quad \hat{V}(w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\psi}_i(w) \hat{\psi}_i(w)',$$

where $\hat{\psi}_i(w) = \hat{\Psi}_{i,H} w - \hat{\psi}_{i,h}$. Using $\hat{V}(w)$, we construct $\hat{\Omega}(w) = B_2' \hat{V}(w) B_2$. The confidence set $C_{1-\alpha}$ is constructed as explained in Procedure 1.

Example 2.5 (Synthetic Control with Group-Level Weights, Cont'd). In this case, we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mu}_{j,t} - \mu_{j,t}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{ij,t} + o_p(1),$$

where

$$\psi_{ij,t} = \frac{1\{G_i = j\}}{P\{G_i = j\}} (Y_{i,t} - \mathbf{E}[Y_{i,t} | G_i = j]).$$

Therefore, $\Psi_{i,H}$ is the matrix whose (j, k) -th entry is given by $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\psi_{ij,t} \mu_{k,t} + \mu_{j,t} \psi_{ik,t})$ and $\psi_{i,h}$ is the K -dimensional vector whose k -th entry is given by $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\psi_{i0,t} \mu_{k,t} + \mu_{0,t} \psi_{ik,t})$. We obtain $V_p(w) = \mathbf{E}_p [\psi_i(w) \psi_i(w)']$, where $\psi_i(w) = \Psi_{i,H} w - \psi_{i,h}$. ■

Example 2.6 (Distributional Synthetic Control, Cont'd). Suppose that $\hat{F}_k(q)$ is the empirical CDF of the outcome distribution in population k , such that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{F}_k(q) - F_k(q)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{i,k}(q) + o_p(1).$$

Then, the (j, k) -th entry of $\Psi_{i,H}$ is given as follows:

$$\int_0^\infty (\psi_{i,k}(q) F_j^{-1}(q) + \psi_{i,j}(q) F_k^{-1}(q)) dq,$$

and the k -th entry of $\psi_{i,h}$ is given by

$$\int_0^\infty (\psi_{i,0}(q) F_k^{-1}(q) + \psi_{i,k}(q) F_0^{-1}(q)) dq.$$

We obtain $V_p(w) = \mathbf{E}_p [\psi_i(w) \psi_i(w)']$, where $\psi_i(w) = \Psi_{i,H} w - \psi_{i,h}$. ■

In some applications, the computation and estimation of $V_p(w)$ can be cumbersome for practitioners, because the practitioner has to find an analytical form of $V_p(w)$ in their application to find its consistent estimator. In such cases, an alternative is to use a bootstrap estimator of $V_p(w)$. As shown by [Hahn and Liao \(2021\)](#), the asymptotic validity of the inference procedure is preserved under the bootstrap, while the inference procedure is conservative in general.³ Suppose that $\hat{\varphi}^*(w)$ is constructed from the bootstrap sample, such that the bootstrap distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\varphi}^*(w) - \hat{\varphi}(w))$ converges almost surely to $N(0, V_p(w))$. Then, we obtain the bootstrap variance estimator:

$$\hat{V}^*(w) = \mathbf{E}^* [n(\hat{\varphi}^*(w) - \hat{\varphi}(w))(\hat{\varphi}^*(w) - \hat{\varphi}(w))'],$$

where \mathbf{E}^* denotes the expectation with respect to the bootstrap distribution. Suppose that w_0 is point-identified and minimizer \hat{w} of $\hat{Q}(w)$ over $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$ is consistent. Then, in place of $\hat{\Omega}(w)$, we can use

$$\hat{\Omega}^*(\hat{w}) = B_2' \hat{V}^*(\hat{w}) B_2$$

to construct the confidence set $C_{1-\alpha}$. This suggests the following modified inference procedure:

PROCEDURE 2: CONFIDENCE SET FOR w_0 WITH A BOOTSTRAP VARIANCE ESTIMATOR

³Alternatively, we can modify the bootstrap variance estimator using a truncation method proposed by [Shao \(1992\)](#) to render the inference procedure asymptotically non-conservative. See also [Gonçalves and White \(2005\)](#).

Input: the matrix B_2 , $\hat{f}(w)$, $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$, and $\hat{\Omega}^*(\hat{w})$.

for $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$,

(Step 1) solve

$$\tilde{\lambda}(w) \in \underset{\lambda}{\operatorname{argmin}} (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \lambda)' \hat{\Omega}^{*-1}(\hat{w}) (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \lambda),$$

under the constraints: $w' \lambda = 0$ and $\lambda \geq 0$,

(Step 2) let $\tilde{d}(w)$ be the number of zeros in the vector $B_2 \hat{\Omega}^{*-1}(\hat{w}) (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \tilde{\lambda}(w))$.

(Step 3) let $\tilde{c}_{1-\alpha}(w)$ be the $1 - \alpha$ percentile of the $\chi_{\tilde{k}(w)}^2$ distribution, where

$$\tilde{k}(w) = \max\{K - 1 - \tilde{d}(w), 1\}.$$

end for.

Output: confidence set:

$$(7) \quad C_{1-\alpha}^* = \{w \in \Delta_{K-1} : \tilde{T}(w) \leq \tilde{c}_{1-\alpha}(w)\},$$

where $\tilde{T}(w) = n (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \tilde{\lambda}(w))' \hat{\Omega}^{*-1}(\hat{w}) (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \tilde{\lambda}(w))$.

Suppose that the main parameter of interest $\theta_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ depends on w_0 as follows:

$$\theta_0 = \theta(w_0).$$

Then, we can construct a confidence interval for θ_0 using a Bonferroni method. To see this, suppose that the estimator $\hat{\theta}$ satisfies the following asymptotic linear representation:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}(w_0) - \theta(w_0)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{i,\theta}(w_0) + o_p(1) \rightarrow_d N(0, v^2(w_0)),$$

where $v^2(w_0) = \mathbf{E}[\psi_{i,\theta}^2(w_0)]$. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\kappa \in (0, \alpha)$, the $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ -level confidence interval for θ is given by

$$\left\{ \theta \in \mathbf{R} : \inf_{w \in C_{1-\kappa}} \left| \frac{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}(w) - \theta)}{\hat{v}(w)} \right| \leq z_{1-(\alpha-\kappa)/2} \right\},$$

where $\hat{v}^2(w)$ is a consistent estimator of $v^2(w)$ and $z_{1-(\alpha-\kappa)/2}$ denotes the $(1 - (\alpha - \kappa)/2)$ -th quantile of $N(0, 1)$.

Example 2.7 (Parameter Linear in Weights). In many applications, the parameter of interest takes the following form:

$$(8) \quad \theta(w) = q_p' w - m_p, \quad w \in \Delta_{K-1},$$

where q_p and m_p have \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically normal estimators. We can construct a confidence interval for θ_0 using the Bonferroni approach above. Furthermore, its influence

function can be simplified if these estimators admit the following asymptotic linear representation:

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\hat{q} - q_p) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{i,q} + o_p(1), \text{ and} \\ \sqrt{n}(\hat{m} - m_p) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{i,m} + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\psi_{i,q}$, $\psi_{i,m}$ are influence functions that have mean zero and are i.i.d. across i 's. Then, we have $\psi_{i,\theta}(w) = \psi'_{i,q} w - \psi_{i,m}$. ■

2.3. Heuristics and Discussions

2.3.1. Construction of the Test Statistic. Let us give a heuristic motivation behind the construction of the confidence set in Procedure 1. To construct a test statistic, we form the Lagrangian of the constrained optimization in (2):

$$\mathcal{L}(w, \tilde{\lambda}, \lambda) = Q_p(w) + \tilde{\lambda}(w' \mathbf{1} - 1) - \lambda' w,$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}$ and λ are Lagrange multipliers. The necessary and sufficient condition for w_0 to be a solution to the constrained optimization is:

$$\varphi_p(w_0) + \tilde{\lambda} \mathbf{1} - \lambda = 0,$$

for some $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\lambda \in U(w_0)$, where

$$U(w_0) = \{\lambda \in \mathbf{R}^K : w'_0 \lambda = 0 \text{ and } \lambda \geq 0\}.$$

We concentrate out $\tilde{\lambda}$ to obtain the following equality:

$$(I_K - \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}' / K)(\varphi_p(w_0) - \lambda) = 0,$$

for some $\lambda \in U(w_0)$. The equality has K equations but these equations are not linearly independent. To extract maximally linearly independent equations out of these, we premultiply B'_2 to obtain $K - 1$ equations as follows:

$$(10) \quad f_p(w_0) - B'_2 \lambda = 0,$$

for some $\lambda \in U(w_0)$, where $f_p(w_0) = B'_2 \varphi_p(w_0)$. The equality restrictions motivate the test statistic $T(w)$ in Procedure 1.

A similar construction of a test statistic has appeared in the literature of inference from moment inequalities using quasi-likelihood ratios. (See [Rosen \(2008\)](#) and [Moon and Schorfheide \(2009\)](#), and [Cox and Shi \(2022\)](#), to name but a few. See also [Andrews and Shi \(2013\)](#) and [Chen, Christensen, and Tamer \(2018\)](#) for a treatment of this problem in a general framework.)

Closer to our proposal is that of [Cox and Shi \(2022\)](#). They considered the moment inequality model:⁴

$$A\mathbf{E}_p[\bar{m}_n(\theta)] \leq b,$$

where A is a $d_A \times d_m$ matrix, b is a d_A dimensional vector, and $\bar{m}_n(\theta)$ is the sample average of the moment function $m(W_i, \theta)$:

$$\bar{m}_n(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(W_i, \theta).$$

To construct a confidence set, they considered the following test statistic:

$$(11) \quad T_n(\theta) = \inf_{\mu: A\mu \leq b} n(\bar{m}_n(\theta) - \mu)' \hat{\Sigma}(\theta)^{-1} (\bar{m}_n(\theta) - \mu),$$

where

$$\hat{\Sigma}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (m(W_i, \theta) - \bar{m}_n(\theta))(m(W_i, \theta) - \bar{m}_n(\theta))'.$$

Like our proposal, they constructed the critical value from a χ^2 distribution with data-dependent degrees of freedom.

While our problem appears similar to theirs, our testing framework is not necessarily motivated from moment inequality restrictions. Furthermore, our test statistic $T(w)$ does not map directly to their setting. To see this, note that we can rewrite $T(w)$ as follows:

$$T(w) = \inf_{\lambda: w'\lambda = 0, \lambda \geq 0} n(\hat{\varphi}(w) - \lambda)' B_2 \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) B_2' (\hat{\varphi}(w) - \lambda).$$

Unlike $\hat{\Sigma}(\theta)$ in (11), the matrix $B_2 \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) B_2'$ is a singular matrix. Therefore, applying their methods to our setting is far from obvious.

2.3.2. Construction of a Critical Value. To provide an intuition behind the construction of the critical value, it helps to begin with the result of [Mohamad, van Zwet, Cator, and Goeman \(2020\)](#). Suppose that

$$Y \sim N(\mu, \Omega),$$

for some $\mu \in \mathbf{R}^K$ and a symmetric positive definite matrix Ω . We introduce a polyhedral cone $\Lambda(w)$ as follows:

$$(12) \quad \Lambda(w) := \{B_2' \lambda : w' \lambda = 0 \text{ and } \lambda \geq 0, \lambda \in \mathbf{R}^K\}.$$

⁴Importantly, [Cox and Shi \(2022\)](#)'s framework accommodates a model with a nuisance parameter that enters the moment inequality restrictions in an additive form. To facilitate the comparison, we only discuss a simplified version of their model without a nuisance parameter here.

Define the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$ as $\|x\|_\Omega = \sqrt{x'\Omega^{-1}x}$, $x \in \mathbf{R}^K$. Then we focus on the test statistic of the form:

$$T_0(w) = \|Y - \Pi_\Omega(Y | \Lambda(w))\|_\Omega^2,$$

where $\Pi_\Omega(Y | C)$ for a closed convex set C denotes the projection of Y on C along $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$. Let $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ be the polar cone of $\Lambda(w)$ and let F_ℓ , $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, be the faces of $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ and $\text{ri}(F_\ell)$ their relative interiors. Furthermore, let k_ℓ be the rank of the projection matrix of Y onto the linear span of F_ℓ . Then, Theorem 2.1 of [Mohamad, van Zwet, Cator, and Goeman \(2020\)](#) gives the following result:

$$P\{\|Y - \Pi_\Omega(Y | \Lambda(w))\|_\Omega^2 > q_{1-\alpha, \Omega}(Y; w)\} \leq \alpha,$$

where⁵

$$(13) \quad q_{1-\alpha, \Omega}(Y; w) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L G^{-1}(1-\alpha; \max\{k_\ell, 1\}) 1\{\Pi_\Omega(Y | \Lambda^\circ(w)) \in \text{ri}(F_\ell)\},$$

and $G(\cdot; k)$ denotes the CDF of the χ^2 distribution with k degrees of freedom. In order to adapt their result to our setting, we take two steps. First, we find a characterization of the critical value in our setting. Second, we extend the validity result to the desired asymptotic validity result.

We illustrate the main idea here, assuming that $\Omega = I_{K-1}$ and is known. We write simply $q_{1-\alpha}(Y; w)$ instead of $q_{1-\alpha, \Omega}(Y; w)$ and $\Pi(Y | C)$ instead of $\Pi_\Omega(Y | C)$. The general case where Ω is unknown and consistently estimated is dealt with in the proof of the main result in the appendix.

Step 1 (Critical Value Characterization): We first establish the following characterization of the critical value $q_{1-\alpha}(Y; w)$:

$$q_{1-\alpha}(Y; w) = G^{-1}(1-\alpha; k(w)),$$

where

$$k(w) := \max\{K-1-d(w), 1\} \text{ and } d(w) := |J_0[B_2(Y - \Pi(Y | \Lambda(w)))]|,$$

and $J_0[x] = \{j : x_j = 0\}$, the set of the indices of zeros in a vector x . To show this, we find the polar cone $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ of $\Lambda(w)$ as

$$\Lambda^\circ(w) = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [B_2x]_{J_0[w]} \leq 0\},$$

⁵[Mohamad, van Zwet, Cator, and Goeman \(2020\)](#) did not consider the case where the projection of Y onto the polar cone becomes zero with positive probability. Thus, here we take $\max\{k_\ell, 1\}$ in place of k_ℓ as in their paper.

where for any vector a , $[a]_J$ denotes the subvector of a indexed by J . From this, the faces of $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ and their relative interiors are seen to be of the following form: for $J \subset J_0[w]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_J^\circ(w) &= \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [B_2x]_J = 0 \text{ and } [B_2x]_{J_0(w) \setminus J} \leq 0\}, \text{ and} \\ \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w)) &= \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [B_2x]_J = 0 \text{ and } [B_2x]_{J_0[w] \setminus J} < 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

The linear span of $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w))$ is $L_J^\circ := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [B_2x]_J = 0\}$. Hence the rank of the projection matrix onto this space is $K - 1 - |J|$. Furthermore, since the relative interiors, $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w))$, partition the polyhedral cone $\Lambda^\circ(w)$, we find that

$$\Pi(Y \mid \Lambda^\circ(w)) \in \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w)) \text{ if and only if } J_0[B_2\Pi(Y \mid \Lambda^\circ(w))] = J.$$

The projection of Y onto $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ falls on $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w))$ if and only if the projection falls on the latter's linear span L_J° . Therefore, only one of the terms in the sum on the right hand side of (13) realizes. Noting the decomposition

$$Y = \Pi(Y \mid \Lambda(w)) + \Pi(Y \mid \Lambda^\circ(w)),$$

we write this term as $G^{-1}(1 - \alpha; k(w))$.

To illustrate the degrees of freedom $k(w)$ for the χ^2 distribution in the critical value, consider the case $K = 3$ and $w = [1, 0, 0]'$. In this case, the cone $\Lambda(w)$ and its polar cone $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(w) &= \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : x_2 \geq x_1/\sqrt{3}, x_2 \geq -x_1/\sqrt{3}\}, \text{ and} \\ \Lambda^\circ(w) &= \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{R}^2 : x_2 \leq \sqrt{3}x_1, x_2 \leq -\sqrt{3}x_1\}.\end{aligned}$$

There are four faces of $\Lambda^\circ(w)$: $\Lambda_{\{2,3\}}^\circ(w)$, $\Lambda_{\{2\}}^\circ(w)$, $\Lambda_{\{3\}}^\circ(w)$, and $\Lambda_\emptyset^\circ(w)$. The relative interiors of these faces and their corresponding degrees of the χ^2 distribution in the critical value are depicted in Figure 1.

Step 2 (Extension to Asymptotic Validity): So far the result is for a normally distributed random vector Y . In order to accommodate random vectors that are asymptotically normal, we extend the previous result. This extension consists of two components: the asymptotic approximation of the test statistic and that of the critical values. For simplicity, we maintain the assumption that $\hat{\Omega}_n$ is known to be I_{K-1} .

Consider a setting where

$$Y_n = Z_n + \mu_n, \text{ with } Z_n \rightarrow_d Z \sim N(0, I_{K-1}),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. (Note that we allow $\|\mu_n\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.) From Skorohod representation, there exists a probability space and a sequence of random vectors \tilde{Z}_n that have the same distribution as Z_n and $\tilde{Z}_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} Z$ for a random vector $Z \sim N(0, I_{K-1})$. We let $\tilde{Y}_n = \tilde{Z}_n + \mu_n$ and $Y_n^* = Z + \mu_n$.




FIGURE 1. The Relative Interiors of the Faces of $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ and the Degrees of Freedom for χ^2 Distribution

Note: The left plot depicts $\Lambda(w)$ and $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ for the case of $K = 3$ and $w = [1, 0, 0]'$. The four plots on the right depicts the relative interiors of the four faces of $\Lambda^\circ(w)$, presented with the corresponding $d(w)$ and $k(w)$. The relative interiors partition $\Lambda^\circ(w)$. The degrees of the χ^2 distribution depend on which relative interior the projection of Y onto $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ falls. For example, the relative interior with $J = \{2, 3\}$ is $\{0\}$ with the projection reduced to zero. In that case, the degree of freedom of the χ^2 distribution is taken to be 1. The degrees of freedom are largest ($k(w) = 2$), with probability one, when the projection falls on the relative interior of the face $\Lambda_j^\circ(w)$ with $J = \emptyset$.

We focus on the limit behavior of the following test statistic:

$$\tilde{T}_n(w) = \left\| \tilde{Y}_n - \Pi(\tilde{Y}_n \mid \Lambda(w)) \right\|^2, \quad w \in \Delta_{K-1}.$$

Since the projection map on a nonempty, closed convex set is a contraction map, we have

$$\left\| \Pi(\tilde{Y}_n \mid \Lambda^\circ(w)) - \Pi(Y_n^* \mid \Lambda^\circ(w)) \right\| \leq \|\tilde{Y}_n - Y_n^*\| \rightarrow_{a.s.} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, it is not hard to see that, with $T_n^*(w) := \left\| Y_n^* - \Pi(Y_n^* \mid \Lambda(w)) \right\|^2$,

$$\tilde{T}_n(w) - T_n^*(w) \rightarrow_{a.s.} 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The main challenge is to show the asymptotic validity of the critical value in Procedure 1. For this, we prove that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(14) \quad |J_0[B_2 \Pi(\tilde{Y}_n \mid \Lambda^\circ(w))]| = |J_0[B_2 \Pi(Y_n^* \mid \Lambda^\circ(w))]| + o_{a.s.}(1).$$

Since $|J_0[x]|$ is discontinuous in x , this result does not come directly from the convergence, $\tilde{Y}_n - Y_n^* \rightarrow_{a.s.} 0$. For the sake of heuristics, we will provide a rough sketch of the proof.

Since we can scale down \tilde{Y}_n and Y_n^* without changing the number of zeros in B_2 multiplied by their projections on $\Lambda^\circ(w)$, we assume from here on that \tilde{Y}_n and Y_n^* are bounded. We begin by choosing any subsequence and find a further subsequence, along with some $J, J' \subset J_0[w]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi(\tilde{Y}_n | \Lambda^\circ(w)) &= \Pi(\tilde{Y}_n | L_J^\circ), \quad J_0[B_2 \Pi(\tilde{Y}_n | \Lambda^\circ(w))] = J, \text{ and} \\ \Pi(Y_n^* | \Lambda^\circ(w)) &= \Pi(Y_n^* | L_{J'}^\circ), \quad J_0[B_2 \Pi(Y_n^* | \Lambda^\circ(w))] = J'.\end{aligned}$$

Such a subsequence exists because the projection falls onto one and only one relative interior of the faces of $\Lambda^\circ(w)$ in which case the projection is equal to the projection onto the linear span of the face. Since \tilde{Y}_n and Y_n^* are bounded, for any subsequence, there exists a further subsequence and $Y := Z + \mu$ for some $\mu \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ such that $\tilde{Y}_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} Y$ and $Y_n^* \rightarrow_{a.s.} Y$, so that

$$(15) \quad \Pi(Y | L_J^\circ) = \Pi(Y | L_{J'}^\circ).$$

Now, it remains to show that $|J| = |J'|$. Due to the form of B_2 , it turns out that $|J| \neq K-1$ and $|J'| \neq K-1$ and we cannot have both $|J| = K$ and $|J'| < K-1$ or both $|J'| = K$ and $|J| < K-1$. Thus, we have either $|J| = |J'| = K$ or $|J|, |J'| < K-1$. This means that it suffices to focus on the case $|J|, |J'| < K-1$. Since Y is a random vector with a full support over \mathbf{R}^{K-1} and B_2 has full column rank, we find that for any J'' with $|J''| < K-1$,

$$|J_0[B_2 \Pi(Y | L_{J''}^\circ)]| = |J''|,$$

with probability one. On such an event, the equality (15) implies that $|J| = |J'|$. This gives (14) and eventually the desired result of the asymptotic validity of the critical value. We refer the reader to the appendix for details.

3. Uniform Asymptotic Validity

3.1. A Preliminary Result

We first provide a preliminary result. Suppose that $Y_n \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$, $n \geq 1$, is a sequence of random vectors such that

$$(16) \quad Y_n = \hat{\Omega}_n^{1/2} Z_n + \mu_n,$$

where $Z_n \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ is a sequence of asymptotically standard normal random vectors, $\hat{\Omega}_n$ is a sequence of symmetric positive definite $(K-1) \times (K-1)$ random matrices, and $\mu_n \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ is a sequence of nonstochastic vectors. We do not require that the sequence μ_n be bounded.

Our main focus is on the test statistic that is based on the squared error from the projection of Y_n onto $\Lambda(w)$ along the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\hat{\Omega}}$, where $\|x\|_{\hat{\Omega}}^2 = x' \hat{\Omega}^{-1} x$, $x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$, and $\Lambda(w)$ is defined in (12). Recall that $G(\cdot; k)$ denotes the CDF of the χ^2 distribution with the degrees of freedom equal to k and $J_0[x] = \{1 \leq j \leq K : x_j = 0\}$ for any vector $x = [x_j] \in \mathbf{R}^K$. Then, our construction of the confidence set is based on the critical value of the following form:

$$\hat{c}_{1-\alpha}(Y_n; w) := G^{-1}(1 - \alpha; \hat{k}(w)),$$

where

$$\hat{k}(w) := \max\{K - 1 - |J_0[\hat{\delta}_n(w)]|, 1\} \text{ and } \hat{\delta}_n(w) := B_2 \hat{\Omega}_n^{-1}(Y_n - \Pi_{\hat{\Omega}_n}(Y_n | \Lambda(w))).$$

This critical value is random, depending on the data through its dependence on the number of zeros in $\hat{\delta}_n(w)$.

Assumption 3.1. As $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$Z_n \rightarrow_d Z \sim N(0, I_{K-1}) \text{ and } \hat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_n \rightarrow_p 0,$$

for some sequence of nonstochastic $(K-1) \times (K-1)$ symmetric positive definite matrices Ω_n such that for some $\bar{B}, \epsilon > 0$, $\|\Omega_n\| \leq \bar{B}$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\Omega_n) \geq \epsilon$, for all $n \geq 1$, where $\lambda_{\min}(\Omega_n)$ denotes the minimum eigenvalue of Ω_n .

The asymptotic normality of Z_n and consistency of $\hat{\Omega}_n$ are typically satisfied in the applications under consideration in this paper. The following lemma is crucial for the uniform asymptotic validity result.

Lemma 3.1. Suppose that Assumption 3.1 holds. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and for any sequence $w_n \in \Delta_{K-1}$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \left\| Y_n - \Pi_{\hat{\Omega}_n}(Y_n | \Lambda(w_n)) \right\|_{\hat{\Omega}_n}^2 > \hat{c}_{1-\alpha}(Y_n; w_n) \right\} \leq \alpha.$$

This lemma shows that reading the critical values from the χ^2 distribution with the degrees of freedom equal to $\hat{k}(w)$ generates an asymptotically uniformly valid procedure. The proof of the lemma can be potentially useful for many similar settings where the test statistic involves a projection onto a polyhedral cone.

3.2. The Main Result

Let us move onto the main result of the asymptotic validity of the confidence set $C_{1-\alpha}$ for w_0 . First, we introduce a set of assumptions. From here on, \mathcal{P}_n denotes the set of probability distributions of data that are under consideration. Our goal is to establish the uniform asymptotic

validity of the confidence set $C_{1-\alpha}$ for w_0 over the class of probability distributions \mathcal{P}_n . Define $f_p(w) := B_2' \varphi_p(w)$ and $\Omega_p(w) := B_2' V_p(w) B_2$.

Assumption 3.2. For each $P_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and each $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$, there exists a sequence of symmetric positive definite matrices, $\Omega_{P_n}(w)$, such that the following conditions are satisfied for any sequence of probabilities $P_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and any sequence of weights $w_n \in \mathbb{W}_{P_n}$.

(i) For each $t \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$, we have

$$P_n \left\{ \Omega_{P_n}^{-1/2}(w_n) \sqrt{n} (\hat{f}(w_n) - f_{P_n}(w_n)) \leq t \right\} \rightarrow \Phi(t),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where Φ is the CDF of the standard normal random vector.

(ii) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Omega_{P_n}(w_n)\|^2 < \infty$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\min}(\Omega_{P_n}(w_n)) > 0$.

(iii) For any $\epsilon > 0$, and along any sequence $w_n \in \Delta_{K-1}$,

$$P_n \left\{ \|\hat{\Omega}(w_n) - \Omega_{P_n}(w_n)\| > \epsilon \right\} \rightarrow 0.$$

Condition (i) requires the asymptotic normality of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{f}(w_n) - f_{P_n}(w_n))$ that is uniform over the probabilities in \mathcal{P}_n . This condition is satisfied in many settings where the quantity $\varphi_p(w)$ is “regular”, i.e., behaves “smoothly” in the perturbation of P . Condition (ii) requires that the limit distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{f}(w_n) - f_{P_n}(w_n))$ is non-degenerate uniformly over the probabilities in \mathcal{P}_n . Condition (iii) requires the variance estimator $\hat{\Omega}(w_n)$ to be consistent for $\Omega_p(w_n)$ uniformly over the probabilities in \mathcal{P}_n .

Thus, the conditions in Assumption 3.2 essentially define the scope of the method and are satisfied in many settings. By applying Lemma 3.1, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \inf_{w \in \mathbb{W}_P} P \{w \in C_{1-\alpha}\} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

The proof is found in the appendix of this paper. To see how Lemma 3.1 gives this validity result, observe that

$$T(w) = \left\| Y_n(w) - \Pi_{\hat{\Omega}(w)}(Y_n(w) \mid \Lambda(w)) \right\|_{\hat{\Omega}(w)}^2,$$

where $\Pi_{\hat{\Omega}(w)}(Y_n(w) \mid \Lambda(w))$ is the projection of Y_n onto $\Lambda(w)$ along the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\hat{\Omega}(w)}$ and

$$Y_n(w) = \sqrt{n} \hat{f}(w).$$

Thus, the test statistic $T(w)$ is nothing but the squared length of the projection error in projecting $Y_n(w)$ onto the polyhedral cone $\Lambda(w)$ along the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\hat{\Omega}(w)}$. Since

$$Y_n(w) = \sqrt{n}(\hat{f}(w) - f_{P_n}(w)) + \mu_n(w),$$

where $\mu_n(w) = \sqrt{n}f_{p_n}(w)$, and the random vector $Y_n(w)$ is asymptotically normal, yet with a potentially diverging shift $\mu_n(w)$.⁶ This setting maps to the one in Lemma 3.1. The uniform asymptotic validity of the confidence set $C_{1-\alpha}$ for w_0 follows from the lemma.

3.3. Monte Carlo Simulations

We now turn to Monte Carlo simulations to evaluate the finite sample performance of our procedure. Our set-up follows Example 2.1 and the literature on synthetic control with individual data, which are of significant applied interest (see Abadie and L'Hour (2021)). This will also be the focus of our empirical application below.

We consider a treated group (0) and K untreated groups, where $K \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. Each group j has a sample size $n_j \in \{100, 200, 1000\}$. The outcomes for individual i in group j , $Y_{ij,t}$, are realized over T periods, but only the first $T_0 = 10$ periods are used to match the treated and untreated groups.

We generate the pre-treatment outcomes for the untreated groups $j = 1, \dots, K$ using the linear model:

$$Y_{ij,t} = \mu_{j,t} + \varepsilon_{ij,t},$$

where $\mu_{j,t} = 0.5 + 0.5(-1)^{j-1} \frac{t}{T} + 0.5\eta_{j,t}$, $\eta_{j,t} \sim_{i.i.d.} N(0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_{ij,t} \sim_{i.i.d.} N(0, 1)$. Thus, the mean outcome for j , $\mu_{j,t}$ is composed by a deterministic component and a random component. The former grows over time for odd-numbered j , while it decreases over time for even-numbered groups. The random component is fixed throughout simulations. Individual outcomes in a group are noisy observations of the associated means.

We draw data for the treated group as:

$$Y_{i0,t} = \mu_{0,t} + \varepsilon_{i0,t},$$

where $\mu_{0,t} = w_0' \mu_t$, $\mu_t = (\mu_{1,t}, \dots, \mu_{K,t})'$, $w_0 \in \Delta_{K-1}$, and $\varepsilon_{i0,t} \sim_{iid} N(0, 1)$ across i and t . Thus, the expected outcomes for the treated group are a weighted (synthetic) combination of expected outcomes from the untreated groups with weights, w_0 .⁷ We consider the setting where $T > K$ and there is no linear dependency between the population means $\mu_{j,t}$, $j = 0, \dots, K$. Hence the weights w_0 are point-identified.

⁶Note that we allow for the possibility that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{p_n}(w_n) \neq 0$ such as when w_n lies on the boundary of the simplex Δ_{K-1} , and in this case, the sequence $\|\mu_n(w_n)\|$ may diverge to ∞ , as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

⁷While this may resemble the assumption in the synthetic control literature that the outcomes of the treated group have a perfect match in the untreated ones, there is a major distinction: we impose the matching on the population quantities rather than on their sample counterparts. It is important for us to distinguish between population and sample. Otherwise, there is no inference to be made on w_0 . For the same reason, the observed outcomes are noisy observations of the population means in our setting.

TABLE 1. The Empirical Coverage Probability for w_0 at 95% Nominal Level

	Interior w_0			Boundary w_0		
	$K = 3$	$K = 5$	$K = 7$	$K = 3$	$K = 5$	$K = 7$
$n_j = 100$	0.957	0.945	0.954	0.980	0.971	0.997
$n_j = 200$	0.950	0.948	0.961	0.963	0.965	0.991
$n_j = 1000$	0.958	0.953	0.956	0.973	0.953	0.990

Notes: The table reports the empirical coverage probability of the confidence set for w_0 from our procedure at level $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ across two main specifications: the first with an interior w_0 and the second with a w_0 on the boundary of the simplex. Details are provided in the main text. The number of simulations is 1000.

The weight w_0 is the key object in inference. We consider two main specifications, each one presenting a different case of whether w_0 is interior or on the boundary of the simplex. In the former (Specification 1), we set $w_0 = (0.2, 0.8\mathbf{1}'_{K-1}/(K-1))'$, so that w_0 lies in the interior of Δ_{K-1} , while, in the latter (Specification 2), $w_0 = (0.5, 0.5, \mathbf{0}'_{K-2})'$, so that w_0 lies on the boundary of Δ_{K-1} , where $\mathbf{1}_d$ and $\mathbf{0}_d$ are d -dimensional vectors of 1's and 0's, respectively. In each of 1000 simulations, we independently draw $(\varepsilon_{i0,t}, \varepsilon_{i1,t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{K,t})'$ for $t = 1, \dots, T_0$ and $i = 1, \dots, n_j$, while keeping $\mu_{j,t}$ fixed. All results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that our procedure works very well in finite samples across scenarios. Let us start with the interior weights case (Specification 1). In line with the theory, coverage probabilities are very close to nominal levels across specifications. This holds even for small sample sizes ($n_j = 100, K = 3$), with empirical coverage probabilities between 94.5-96%. The results continue to hold as n_j grows because our asymptotic results are based on the total sample size (numbers of individuals times number of groups).

The results from Specification 2 show that our procedure also works well even when w_0 is on the boundary of the simplex. Indeed, coverage probabilities are close or above the nominal 95% across specifications and sample sizes. While they seem conservative for small sample sizes (close to 97-98% for small K or n_j), they get closer to 95% as both grow. Indeed, they are 95.3% when $K = 5$ and $n_j = 1000$, although the coverage probability is somewhat conservative when K gets close to T_0 .

Sometimes researchers are interested in inference on an individual component of w_0 rather than inference on the full vector w_0 . For example, one may be interested in the weight that the synthetic method gives to a specific untreated region (e.g., state or country) or firm. To that end, one can combine our approach with projection-based subvector inference. Table 2 presents the results of this approach for the first dimension of w_0 in the specifications of Table 1. We report both the empirical coverage probability for $w_{0,1}$ and the mean length of the confidence interval. This also provides information on the power of our inference approach.

TABLE 2. Projection-Based Inference for the First Dimension of w_0 : Empirical Coverage Probability and Length of the Confidence Interval for Scenario 1 Specifications

	Interior w_0			Boundary w_0		
	$K = 3$	$K = 5$	$K = 7$	$K = 3$	$K = 5$	$K = 7$
	Coverage Probability					
$n_j = 100$	0.982	0.992	1	0.990	0.973	0.997
$n_j = 200$	0.970	0.985	0.993	0.980	0.969	0.991
$n_j = 1000$	0.975	0.958	0.964	0.977	0.953	0.990
	Length of the Confidence Interval					
$n_j = 100$	0.167	0.263	0.369	0.132	0.038	0.079
$n_j = 200$	0.113	0.160	0.258	0.091	0.013	0.020
$n_j = 1000$	0.038	0.012	0.023	0.028	0.000	0.000

Notes: The top panel reports the empirical coverage probability of the confidence interval for the projection-based inference for the first dimension of w_0 in the specifications of Table 1 for $1 - \alpha = 0.95$. Details are provided in the main text. The bottom panel reports the associated mean length of the confidence intervals across $R = 1000$ simulations. The latter is computed only on non-empty confidence intervals, thereby making the results conservative.

The projection-based inference works well in finite samples. As expected, it is more conservative than inference on the full w_0 (c.f. Table 1). For $K = 3, 5$ and interior w_0 , the former is about 3 percentage points more conservative than the latter, although such conservativeness decreases with sample size (e.g., it is below 96.5% when $n_j = 1000$ and $K = 5$ regardless of specification). In spite of its conservative nature, projection-based inference is still informative in our setting. Even when sample size is small ($n_j = 100, K = 3$), the average length of the confidence interval can be as short as 0.13 and it is far from spanning $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, for a fixed K and weight w_0 , as sample size n increases, the length of the confidence interval quickly decreases and gets even close to 0: when $n_j = 1000$, the average length is often below 0.03. The latter would be very sharp for inference with a sample size often found in empirical applications with individual-level data. Thus, our simulations suggest that, when w_0 is point-identified and the sample size is large enough, projection-based inference can be informative and not overly conservative.

4. Empirical Application

As an empirical illustration of our method, we study how a large increase in minimum wages in Alaska in 2003, from US\$5.65 to US\$7.15, affected average family income. To do so, we

use individual-level data and state-level weights, as in Example 2.1. This follows a recent strand of the literature that uses synthetic control methods to obtain credible estimates of the effects of minimum wage increases on economic outcomes (e.g., Allegretto, Dube, Reich, and Zipperer (2017), Neumark and Wascher (2017), Powell (2022)) and the analysis of this policy in Gunsilius (2023).

Following Dube (2019) and Gunsilius (2023), our outcome of interest is a measure of household income, called average family income. This is a measure which adjusts for family size and composition (i.e., “equivalized”) and it is measured in multiples of the federal poverty threshold. We use the main sample from Dube (2019) (i.e., individuals aged under 65), originally drawn from the Current Population Survey (CPS), and focus on the subsample from 1998-2002 (i.e., the five years before the policy).

To form a synthetic control, we form a pool of states that resemble Alaska in terms of population and economic activity. We start with states that like Alaska, are among the top-10 oil producing states in 2002 (i.e., prior to the policy), e.g., see Figure 7 in Ismayilova (2007). We then drop states that have a minimum wage increase during the period of interest (California) and states that have a population over 3 million (Texas, Louisiana and Oklahoma). By comparison, Alaska had a population of approximately 650,000 in 2002, U.S. Census Bureau (2002). Our final set of control states is, thus: Kansas, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Dakota and Wyoming ($K = 5$). From this pool, we construct a synthetic comparison state by deriving state-level weights from estimating $\mu_{j,t}$: the mean family income in each state j and year t .

We use our statistical procedure outlined in Section 2.2 and report the projection-based inference for weights and Bonferroni-based confidence interval for a parameter of interest, θ_0 , defined as the difference in mean outcomes in Alaska in 2003 (the year post-policy) relative to the mean in the synthetic control. This can be written as:

$$(17) \quad \theta(w) = \mu_{\text{treat},2003} - \mu'_{\text{ctrl},2003} w,$$

where $\mu_{\text{ctrl},2003} = [\mu_{1,2003}, \mu_{2,2003}, \dots, \mu_{K,2003}]'$ is a vector of the mean average family income across families in the control states and $\theta_0 = \theta(w_0)$. Thus the parameter θ is linear in the weights and fits Example 2.7. We can compute the asymptotic variance $V_p(w)$ as explained in Example 2.1.

The first row of Table 3 presents the confidence interval for the effect of the increase in minimum wages on average family income in 2003. We can reject the null hypothesis that $\theta_0 = 0$ suggesting that this minimum wage policy decreased average family income. Our confidence intervals map to a decrease of 1.8-7.3% relative to a pre-policy (1998-2002) average income of 3.43 times the federal poverty threshold. While it is likely that the poorest households benefit from this policy, the average family may have lost a small amount of income, possibly due

TABLE 3. The Effects of Alaska’s Minimum Wage Increase on Average Family Income

	Specification 1	Specification 2
θ_0 - Change in Average Family Income	[-0.313, -0.080]	[-0.249, -0.062]
w_0 - Kansas	[0.817, 0.957]	[0.819, 0.884]
w_0 - Mississippi	-	[0.004, 0.095]
w_0 - New Mexico	[0.005, 0.088]	[0.001, 0.125]
w_0 - North Dakota	[0.001, 0.120]	[0.001, 0.120]
w_0 - Wyoming	[0.001, 0.147]	[0.000, 0.083]

Notes: The table reports the results of our empirical application on the effects of the minimum wage increase in Alaska in 2003 on average family income (measured in multiples of the federal poverty threshold and adjusted for family size and composition). The first row presents the Bonferoni-based confidence interval for this effect the year after the policy (2003) with $\alpha = 0.05$ and $\kappa = 0.005$. The other rows report the projection-based inference confidence interval at level $1 - \alpha$. The second column uses the full set of control states, while the first column drops Mississippi.

to increased unemployment. Our confidence intervals account for inference on the weights, which contrasts with the standard approach in synthetic control, where the synthetic weights are assumed to hold exactly for any realization of the sample.

Table 3 further reports projection-based confidence intervals for weights across two choices of control units (with and without Mississippi). Kansas often received the largest weights (i.e., with confidence intervals centered around 0.85), while the others have relatively similar confidence intervals centered around 0.05. Meanwhile, the average length of the confidence intervals is around 0.1. This provides further support to the findings in the simulations that projection-based inference can be informative in this context.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a new method for inference on the simplex-constrained weights. Our method is based on the projection of an asymptotically normal statistic onto a polyhedral cone. We show that the critical value for the test statistic can be read from the χ^2 distribution with data-dependent degrees of freedom. This leads to an asymptotically uniformly valid confidence set for the weights. We provide a proof of this result and show that it is applicable to a wide range of settings. We also show that the method works well in finite samples through

Monte Carlo simulations. We apply our method to a synthetic control example and show that it can be useful in practice.

References

- ABADIE, A. (2021): “Using synthetic controls: Feasibility, data requirements, and methodological aspects,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 59(2), 391–425.
- ABADIE, A., AND J. L’HOUR (2021): “A Penalized Synthetic Control Estimator for Disaggregated Data,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536), 1817–1834.
- ALLEGRETTO, S., A. DUBE, M. REICH, AND B. ZIPPERER (2017): “Credible Research Designs for Minimum Wage Studies: A Response to Neumark, Salas, and Wascher,” *ILR Review*, 70(3), 559–592.
- ANDREWS, D. W. K. (1999): “Estimation When a Parameter is on a Boundary,” *Econometrica*, pp. 1341–1383.
- ANDREWS, D. W. K., AND X. SHI (2013): “Inference Based on Conditional Moment Inequalities,” *Econometrica*, 81, 609–666.
- BILLINGSLEY, P. (1999): *Convergence of Probability Measures*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, New York.
- CHEN, X., T. M. CHRISTENSEN, AND E. TAMER (2018): “Monte Carlo Confidence Sets for Identified Sets,” *Econometrica*, 86, 1965–2018.
- CHENEY, W., AND A. A. GOLDSTEIN (1959): “Proximity Maps for Convex Sets,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 10, 448–450.
- COX, G., AND X. SHI (2022): “Simple Adaptive Size-Exact Testing for Full-Vector and Subvector Inference in Moment Inequality Models,” *Forthcoming in Review of Economic Studies*.
- DUBE, A. (2019): “Minimum Wages and the Distribution of Family Incomes,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 11(4), 268–304.
- FANG, Z., AND J. SEO (2021): “A Projection Framework for Testing Shape Restrictions That Form Convex Cones,” *Econometrica*, 89(5), 2439–2458.
- FERMAN, B., AND C. PINTO (2021): “Synthetic controls with imperfect pretreatment fit,” *Quantitative Economics*, 12(4), 1197–1221.
- GEYER, C. J. (1994): “On the Asymptotics of Constrained M-Estimation,” *Annals of Statistics*, 22, 1993 – 2010.
- GONÇALVES, S., AND H. WHITE (2005): “Bootstrap Standard Error Estimates for Linear Regression,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100, 970–979.
- GUNSILIUS, F. F. (2023): “Distributional Synthetic Controls,” *Econometrica*, 91(3), 1105–1117.
- HAHN, J., AND Z. LIAO (2021): “Bootstrap Standard Error Estimates and Inference,” *Econometrica*, 89(4), 1963–1977.

- HANSEN, B. E. (2007): “Least Squares Model Averaging,” *Econometrica*, 75, 1175–1189.
- ISMAYILOVA, R. M. (2007): “An analysis of producing ethanol and electric power from woody residues and agricultural crops in East Texas,” Ph.D. thesis, Texas A&M University.
- KREIF, N., R. GRIEVE, D. HANGARTNER, A. J. TURNER, S. NIKOLOVA, AND M. SUTTON (2016): “Examination of the synthetic control method for evaluating health policies with multiple treated units,” *Health economics*, 25(12), 1514–1528.
- MOHAMAD, D. A., E. W. VAN ZWET, E. CATOR, AND J. J. GOEMAN (2020): “Adaptive Critical Value for Constrained Likelihood Ratio Testing,” *Biometrika*, 107(3), 677–688.
- MOON, H. R. M., AND F. SCHORFHEIDE (2009): “Estimation with Overidentifying Inequality Moment Conditions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 153, 136–154.
- NEUMARK, D., AND W. WASCHER (2017): “Reply to “Credible Research Designs for Minimum Wage Studies,”” *ILR Review*, 70(3), 593–609.
- POWELL, D. (2022): “Synthetic Control Estimation Beyond Comparative Case Studies: Does the Minimum Wage Reduce Employment?,” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 40(3), 1302–1314.
- ROCKAFELLAR, R. T. (1970): *Convex Analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- ROCKAFELLAR, R. T., AND R. J.-B. WETS (2004): *Variational Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- ROSEN, A. M. (2008): “Confidence Sets for Partially Identified Parameters that Satisfy a Finite Number of Moment Inequalities,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 146(1), 107–117.
- SHAO, J. (1992): “Bootstrap Variance Estimators with Truncation,” *Statistics & probability letters*, 15(2), 95–101.
- SILVAPULLE, M. J., AND P. K. SEN (2005): *Constrained Statistical Inference: Inequality, Order, and Shape Restrictions*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey.
- TIMMERMANN, A. (2006): “Forecast Combinations,” in *Handbook of Economic Forecasting*, ed. by G. Elliott, C. W. J. Granger, and A. Timmermann, vol. 1, pp. 135–196. Elsevier.
- U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (2002): “State Population Estimates: 2000 to 2002,” Available online: <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/tables/2000-2002/state/totals/st-est2002-02.pdf>. Accessed: 2024-11-11.
- XIA, W., R. J. HYNDMAN, F. LI, AND Y. KANG (2023): “Forecast Combinations: an Over 50-Year Review,” *Forecast Combinations: an Over 50-Year Review*, 39, 1518–1547.

6. Appendix: Mathematical Proofs

Given a symmetric positive definite matrix Ω , we define the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$ as $\|x\|_\Omega = \sqrt{x'\Omega^{-1}x}$ and inner product $\langle x, y \rangle_\Omega = x'\Omega^{-1}y$. Given a nonempty, closed, convex set C , take the projection $\Pi_\Omega(y \mid C)$ (along the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$) to be the solution to the following minimization problem:

$$(18) \quad \inf_{x \in C} \|y - x\|_\Omega^2.$$

Since Ω is positive definite and C is closed and convex, the projection $\Pi_\Omega(y \mid C)$ exists and is unique. For any vector $x \in \mathbf{R}^k$ and a matrix $A \in \mathbf{R}^{k \times k}$, we denote $[x]_j$ to mean its j -th entry and $[A]_j$ to mean its j -th row vector. For any nonempty $J \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$, $[x]_J$ denotes the subvector of x whose entries consist of $[x]_j$, $j \in J$, and $[A]_J$ denotes the submatrix of A whose rows consist of $[A]_j$, $j \in J$. For any matrix A , $\text{rk}(A)$ denotes the rank of A . For a matrix A , $\|A\|$ denotes the Frobenius norm of A , i.e., $\|A\| = \sqrt{\text{tr}(A'A)}$.

Let $\bar{K} := \{1, \dots, K\}$. For any vector $x \in \mathbf{R}^K$, recall the definition: $J_0[x] := \{j \in \bar{K} : [x]_j = 0\}$. An inequality between vectors is understood as holding element-wise. We also assume that any inequality or equality that involves a vector $[x]_J$ with $J = \emptyset$ is vacuously true. Let

$$M := B_2 \Omega^{-1}.$$

Recall $\Lambda(w) := \{B_2' \lambda \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : \lambda \geq 0, w' \lambda = 0, \lambda \in \mathbf{R}^K\}$, $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$. Its polar cone is given by

$$\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega) := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [Mx]_{J_0[w]} \leq 0\}.$$

For each $J \subset \bar{K}$, define

$$\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega) := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [Mx]_J = 0, [Mx]_{J_0[w] \setminus J} \leq 0\}.$$

The linear span of $\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)$ and its relative interior (relative to its linear span) are given by

$$(19) \quad L_J(\Omega) := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [Mx]_J = 0\} \text{ and} \\ \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)) := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [Mx]_J = 0, [Mx]_{J_0[w] \setminus J} < 0\}.$$

Each face of $\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$ takes the form of $\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)$, $J \subset J_0[w]$. For notational brevity, we write

$$\pi_\Omega^\circ(Y; w) := M \Pi_\Omega(Y \mid \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)).$$

6.1. Preliminary Results

Lemma 6.1. (i) For each $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$, there exists a nonempty subset $\mathcal{J}(w, \Omega) \subset 2^{J_0[w]}$ such that the sets, $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega))$, $J \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$, partition $\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$.

(ii) For any $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$ and $J \subset \bar{K}$, there exists $J' \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$ such that $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)) = \text{ri}(\Lambda_{J'}^\circ(w, \Omega))$.

(iii) For any $x \in \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$ with any $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$, and for any $J \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$, $x \in \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega))$ if and only if $J_0[Mx] = J$.

Proof: (i) Fix $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$. Since $\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)$, $J \subset J_0[w]$, are the faces of the polyhedral cone $\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$, if there exist $J, J' \subset J_0[w]$ such that $J \neq J'$, the relative interiors, $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega))$ and $\text{ri}(\Lambda_{J'}^\circ(w, \Omega))$, are either disjoint or identical by Corollary 18.1.2 and Theorem 18.2 of [Rockafellar \(1970\)](#), p.163-164. This implies that $2^{J_0[w]}$ admits an equivalence class where if J and J' belong to the same set in the class, $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega))$ and $\text{ri}(\Lambda_{J'}^\circ(w, \Omega))$ are identical, and otherwise, they are disjoint. We can construct $\mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$ by choosing one set J from each set in the equivalence class.

(ii) Take $J \subset \bar{K}$. Since $\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)$ is a face of $\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$, there exists $J' \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$ such that $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)) = \text{ri}(\Lambda_{J'}^\circ(w, \Omega))$ by (i).

(iii) The result follows because $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega))$, $J \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$, partition $\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$. ■

Lemma 6.2. *No row of the matrices B_2 and M consists of zeros only.*

Proof: No row of B_2 is a zero vector, because no diagonal element of $B_2 B_2' = I_K - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'/K$ is zero. Consider M . Suppose that there exists a row of M that consists of zeros only. Let the row be the j -th row of M . This means that

$$[B_2]_j c_k = 0, \text{ for all } k = 1, \dots, K-1,$$

where c_k denotes the k -th column of Ω^{-1} and $[B_2]_j$ the j -th row vector of B_2 . Then all columns of Ω^{-1} lie in the linear space orthogonal to $[B_2]_j$. However, the dimension of $[B_2]_j$ is $K-1$ and is not a zero vector by the previous result. This contradicts the fact that Ω is positive definite. ■

Lemma 6.3. *Let $Y \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ be a random vector following $N(0, \Omega)$ for a symmetric positive definite matrix Ω . Then, for each $J \subset \bar{K}$ such that $|J| < K-1$,*

$$(20) \quad P \{ |J_0[M\Pi_\Omega(Y + \mu | L_J(\Omega))]| = |J|, \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathbf{Q}^{K-1} \} = 1,$$

where \mathbf{Q} denotes the set of rational numbers.

Proof: Suppose that $J = \emptyset$. Then, $L_J(\Omega) = \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$. Hence, for each $\mu \in \mathbf{Q}^{K-1}$,

$$M\Pi_\Omega(Y + \mu | L_J(\Omega)) = M(Y + \mu) = B_2 \Omega^{-1}(Y + \mu).$$

Note that $\zeta := \Omega^{-1}(Y + \mu)$ is a continuous random vector having the full support of \mathbf{R}^{K-1} . For any $j \in \bar{K}$, $[B_2 \zeta]_j = 0$ if and only if $[B_2]_j \zeta = 0$. No row vector of B_2 is a zero vector by [Lemma 6.2](#). Hence,

$$P \{ J_0[M\Pi_\Omega(Y + \mu | L_J(\Omega))] = \emptyset \} = P \{ J_0[B_2 \zeta] = \emptyset \} = 1.$$

Fix a nonempty $J \subset \bar{K}$ such that $|J| < K - 1$. Let $M_{\bar{K} \setminus J}$ be the matrix obtained by deleting the columns of M corresponding to J . By Lemma 6.2, no row of $M_{\bar{K} \setminus J}$ consists of zeros only. For each $j \in J$, the j -th entry of $\Pi_\Omega(Y + \mu \mid L_J(\Omega))$ is zero. Since $[\Pi_\Omega(Y + \mu \mid L_J(\Omega))]_{\bar{K} \setminus J} \in \mathbf{R}^{K-J}$ is a continuous random vector that has the full support in $\mathbf{R}^{K-|J|}$, we have

$$P \{J_0 [M_{\bar{K} \setminus J} [\Pi_\Omega(Y + \mu \mid L_J(\Omega))]_{\bar{K} \setminus J}] = \emptyset\} = 1.$$

The desired result follows because

$$|J_0 [M \Pi_\Omega(Y + \mu \mid L_J(\Omega))]| = |J| + |J_0 [M_{\bar{K} \setminus J} [\Pi_\Omega(Y + \mu \mid L_J(\Omega))]_{\bar{K} \setminus J}]|,$$

and the set of $\mu \in \mathbf{Q}^{K-1}$ is countable. ■

Lemma 6.4. *For all nonempty $J \subset \bar{K}$ such that $|J| \leq K - 1$,*

$$\text{rk}([B_2]_J) = |J|.$$

Proof: Let $A_J = S_J(I_K - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'/K)S_J'$, where S_J is a $J \times K$ selection matrix such that $S_J U$ for any matrix U selects the rows of U indexed by J . Since $B_2 B_2' = I_K - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'/K$ and $[B_2]_J = S_J B_2$, $\text{rk}([B_2]_J) = \text{rk}(A_J)$. For each $i \in J$, let d_i denote the column vector of A_J which is the subvector of the i -th column vector of $I_K - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}'/K$. Suppose to the contrary that $\text{rk}(A_J) < |J|$. Then there exists $i \in J$ such that, with $J' := J \setminus \{i\}$,

$$(21) \quad d_i = \sum_{j \in J'} a_j d_j,$$

for some constants a_j . Let \tilde{e}_i be the K -dim vector whose i -th entry is one and the other entries zero. For each $i \in J$, let $e_i = S_J \tilde{e}_i$. Note that $d_i = e_i - \mathbf{1}/K \in \mathbf{R}^{|J|}$. The equality in (21) involves $|J|$ equations, where the i -th equation and the ℓ -th equation with $\ell \in J'$ take the following form:

$$1 - \frac{1}{K} = - \sum_{j \in J'} \frac{a_j}{K} \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{1}{K} = a_\ell - \sum_{j \in J'} \frac{a_j}{K}.$$

This implies that $a_\ell = -1$ for all $\ell \in J'$. The first equation above then yields

$$1 - \frac{1}{K} = \frac{|J| - 1}{K},$$

or $|J| = K$, which contradicts the condition that $|J| \leq K - 1$. ■

Lemma 6.5. *For each $J \subset \bar{K}$, let P_J be the $(K - 1) \times (K - 1)$ projection matrix onto $L_J(\Omega)$ (along the norm $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$). Also, let $a_{m,J}$ be the m -th row vector of $M P_J$. Then, the following statements hold.*

- (i) *If $|J| \leq K - 1$, then $\text{rk}(P_J) = K - 1 - |J|$.*
- (ii) *If $J \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$, then $a_{m,J} \neq 0$ for all $m \in \bar{K} \setminus J$.*

Proof: (i) If $J = \emptyset$, $L_J(\Omega) = \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ and $\text{rk}(P_J) = K - 1$. Suppose that $J \neq \emptyset$. Note that

$$L_J(\Omega) = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [Mx]_J = 0\} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} : [M]_J x = 0\}.$$

Hence, $\text{rk}(P_J) = K - 1 - \text{rk}([M]_J) = K - 1 - \text{rk}([B_2]_J) = K - 1 - |J|$, by Lemma 6.4.

(ii) If $J = \bar{K}$, the statement is vacuously true. Suppose that $J \neq \bar{K}$. Since $\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)$ is a nonempty convex set, $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega))$ is also nonempty (see, e.g., Proposition 2.40 of Rockafellar and Wets (2004)). Take $y \in \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega))$. Then, since $y \in \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$,

$$\Pi_\Omega(y \mid \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)) = y \in \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)).$$

Furthermore $J_0[M\Pi_\Omega(y \mid \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega))] = J$ by Lemma 6.1(iii). Hence, for each $m \in \bar{K} \setminus J$,

$$[M\Pi_\Omega(y \mid \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega))]_m = [MP_J y]_m = \langle a_{m,J}, y \rangle \neq 0.$$

This implies that $a_{m,J} \neq 0$ for all $m \in \bar{K} \setminus J$. ■

The following lemma gives a characterization of the critical value in Theorem 1 of Mohamad, van Zwet, Cator, and Goeman (2020).

Lemma 6.6. *Suppose that $Y \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ is a random vector following $N(\mu, \Omega)$, with a symmetric positive definite $(K - 1) \times (K - 1)$ matrix Ω . Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$,*

$$(22) \quad P \left\{ \|Y - \Pi_\Omega(Y \mid \Lambda(w))\|_\Omega^2 > c_{1-\alpha, \Omega}(Y; w) \right\} \leq \alpha,$$

where

$$(23) \quad c_{1-\alpha, \Omega}(y; w) = G^{-1} \left(1 - \alpha; \max \{K - 1 - |J_0[\pi_\Omega^\circ(y; w)]|, 1\} \right), \quad y \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1},$$

and $G(\cdot; k)$ is the CDF of the χ^2 distribution with degrees of freedom equal to k .

Proof: Let F_ℓ , $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, be the faces of the polyhedral cone $\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$, and let $\text{ri}(F_\ell)$ be the relative interior of F_ℓ . Then, by Theorem 1 of Mohamad, van Zwet, Cator, and Goeman (2020),⁸ we have

$$(24) \quad P \left\{ \|Y - \Pi_\Omega(Y \mid \Lambda(w))\|_\Omega^2 > q_{1-\alpha, \Omega}(Y; w) \right\} \leq \alpha,$$

where

$$(25) \quad q_{1-\alpha, \Omega}(Y; w) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbf{1}\{\Pi_\Omega(Y \mid \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)) \in \text{ri}(F_\ell)\} G^{-1} \left(1 - \alpha; \max\{\text{rk}(P_\ell), 1\} \right),$$

⁸Note that they apply Lemma 3.13.2 of Silvapulle and Sen (2005), p.125, which uses the orthogonal decomposition of \mathbf{R}^K equipped with the inner product $\langle a, b \rangle = a'b$. However, the lemma continues to hold with any other inner product, with the definition of projections and orthogonal complements appropriately redefined.

P_ℓ denotes the projection matrix (along $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$) onto the linear span of F_ℓ . It suffices to show that

$$q_{1-\alpha,\Omega}(Y; w) = c_{1-\alpha,\Omega}(Y; w).$$

In our case with the polyhedral cone $\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$, the faces and their relative interiors are given by $\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)$ and $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega))$, $J \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$ (see, e.g., the proof of Lemma 3.13.5 of [Silvapulle and Sen \(2005\)](#)). Hence, we can rewrite $q_{1-\alpha,\Omega}(Y; w)$ as

$$(26) \quad \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)} 1 \{ \Pi_\Omega(Y | \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)) \in \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w, \Omega)) \} G^{-1}(1 - \alpha; \max \{ \text{rk}(P_J), 1 \}),$$

where P_J is the projection matrix onto $L_J(\Omega)$. Consider $J \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$. Since $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$ and $J \subset J_0[w]$, we have $|J| \leq K - 1$. By Lemma 6.5(i), $\text{rk}(P_J) = K - 1 - |J|$. Since the relative interiors partition $\Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)$, there exists a unique $J^* \in \mathcal{J}(w, \Omega)$ such that $\Pi_\Omega(Y | \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega)) \in \text{ri}(\Lambda_{J^*}^\circ(w, \Omega))$ and, by Lemma 6.1(iii), $J^* = J_0[\pi_\Omega^\circ(Y; w)]$. Hence, from (26),

$$q_{1-\alpha,\Omega}(Y; w) = G^{-1}(1 - \alpha; \max \{ K - 1 - |J_0[\pi_\Omega^\circ(Y; w)]|, 1 \}) = c_{1-\alpha,\Omega}(Y; w).$$

■

Lemma 6.7. *Suppose that x_n and \tilde{x}_n are sequences of vectors in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} , and Ω_n and $\tilde{\Omega}_n$ are sequences of $(K-1) \times (K-1)$ symmetric positive definite matrices such that $\|x_n - \tilde{x}_n\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\Omega_n - \tilde{\Omega}_n\| \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where*

$$(27) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Omega_n\| < \infty \text{ and } \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\min}(\Omega_n) > 0.$$

Suppose further that $C_n \subset \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ is a sequence of nonempty, closed and convex cones. Then, the following statements hold.

$$(i) \quad \left\| \Pi_{\Omega_n}(x_n | C_n) - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n) \right\| \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(ii) *Suppose further that either of the following two conditions holds:*

- (a) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_{\Omega_n}(x_n | C_n)\| < \infty$, or
- (b) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n - \Pi_{\Omega_n}(x_n | C_n)\| < \infty$.

Then,

$$(28) \quad \left\| \Pi_{\Omega_n}(x_n | C_n) - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n) \right\| \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof: (i) Since a projection map on a closed convex set is a contraction map (see, e.g. Theorem 3 of [Cheney and Goldstein \(1959\)](#)),

$$\left\| \Pi_{\Omega_n}(x_n | C_n) - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n) \right\|_{\Omega_n} \leq \|x_n - \tilde{x}_n\|_{\Omega_n} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by the conditions of the lemma and (27).

(ii) Note that

$$(29) \quad \left\| \Pi_{\Omega_n}(x_n | C_n) - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n) \right\| \leq A_{n,1} + A_{n,2},$$

where

$$A_{n,1} = \left\| \Pi_{\Omega_n}(x_n | C_n) - \Pi_{\Omega_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n) \right\| \text{ and } A_{n,2} = \left\| \Pi_{\Omega_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n) - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n) \right\|.$$

By (i), we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{n,1} = 0$. We deal with $A_{n,2}$. Let C_n° denote the polar cone of C_n . Without loss of generality, we assume that Conditionl (a) holds. (The case with Condition (b) can be dealt with by interchanging C_n° with C_n in the proof below.) For simplicity, let

$$a_n = \Pi_{\Omega_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n^\circ) \text{ and } \tilde{a}_n = \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n^\circ).$$

Since $\tilde{x}_n = \Pi_{\Omega_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n) + \Pi_{\Omega_n}(\tilde{x}_n | C_n^\circ)$, it suffices to show that

$$A_{n,2} = \|a_n - \tilde{a}_n\| \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Suppose to the contrary that there exists a subsequence $\{n'\}$ such that $\lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} A_{n',2} > 0$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $0 < \epsilon < \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} A_{n',2}$. Let

$$(30) \quad c_{n'} := \min \{ \lambda_{\min}(\Omega_{n'}^{-1}), \lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}^{-1}) \}.$$

Now, since $\|a_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \geq c_{n'} \|a_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'}\|^2 > c_{n'} \epsilon^2$, note that

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 &= \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + \|a_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + 2 \langle \tilde{a}_{n'} - \tilde{x}_{n'}, a_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'} \rangle_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}} \\ &\geq \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + c_{n'} \epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

(See Lemma 2 in the supplemental note of [Mohamad, van Zwet, Cator, and Goeman \(2020\)](#).)

Similarly,

$$(32) \quad \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \geq \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + c_{n'} \epsilon^2.$$

Define $\tilde{\delta}_{n'} = \lambda_{\min}(\Omega_{n'}^{1/2} \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}^{-1} \Omega_{n'}^{1/2} - I_{K-1})$ and $\delta_{n'} = \lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}^{1/2} \Omega_{n'}^{-1} \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}^{1/2} - I_{K-1})$. Then, for any vector $a \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$, we have

$$\|a\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \geq (1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'}) \|a\|_{\Omega_{n'}}^2 \text{ and } \|a\|_{\Omega_{n'}}^2 \geq (1 + \delta_{n'}) \|a\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2.$$

Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
(33) \quad \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 - c_{n'}\epsilon^2 &\geq \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \quad (\text{by (31)}) \\
&\geq (1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - \tilde{a}_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \\
&\geq (1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + c_{n'}\epsilon^2 \quad (\text{by (32)}) \\
&\geq (1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})((1 + \delta_{n'})\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + c_{n'}\epsilon^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \geq (1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})(1 + \delta_{n'})\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + (1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})c_{n'}\epsilon^2 + c_{n'}\epsilon^2.$$

Using this, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
(34) \quad \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 &\geq (1 + \delta_{n'})\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \\
&\geq (1 + \delta_{n'})^2(1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + (1 + \delta_{n'})(1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})c_{n'}\epsilon^2 \\
&\quad + (1 + \delta_{n'})c_{n'}\epsilon^2 \\
&\geq (1 + \delta_{n'})^2(1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})^2\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 + (1 + \delta_{n'})(1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n'})c_{n'}\epsilon^2 \\
&\quad + (1 + \delta_{n'})c_{n'}\epsilon^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n' \rightarrow 0} A_{n',1} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\| &= \limsup_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{x}_{n'} \mid C_{n'})\| \\
&= \limsup_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(x_{n'} \mid C_{n'})\| < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

by Condition (a). By (27) and the condition $\|\Omega_n - \tilde{\Omega}_n\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\epsilon' := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n > 0$. As $n' \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\delta_{n'}, \tilde{\delta}_{n'} \rightarrow 0$. Hence,

$$\delta_{n'}\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \leq \delta_{n'}\lambda_{\max}(\Omega_{n'}^{-1})\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|^2 \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n' \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, $\tilde{\delta}_{n'}\|\tilde{x}_{n'} - a_{n'}\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 \rightarrow 0$. From (34), this yields $2\epsilon'\epsilon^2 \leq 0$, a contradiction. Hence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{n,2} = 0$. ■

Lemma 6.8. *Suppose that $y_n, \tilde{y}_n, x_n \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ are sequences of vectors such that y_n and \tilde{y}_n are bounded sequences. Suppose further that Ω_n are $(K-1) \times (K-1)$, symmetric positive definite matrices such that $\lambda_{\min}(\Omega_n) > 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then, there exists a bounded sequence \tilde{x}_n such that for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
(35) \quad J_0[\pi_{\Omega_n}^\circ(y_n + x_n; w_n)] &= J_0[\pi_{\Omega_n}^\circ(y_n + \tilde{x}_n; w_n)], \text{ and} \\
J_0[\pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}^\circ(\tilde{y}_n + x_n; w_n)] &= J_0[\pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}^\circ(\tilde{y}_n + \tilde{x}_n; w_n)].
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: We first construct a bounded sequence \tilde{x}_n and then verify that it satisfies the statements in (35). For each pair $J, J' \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)$, we define vectors $a_{m,J}$ and $a_{m,J'}$ as in Lemma 6.5 except that we replace Ω in the definition of M and P_J by Ω_n . Then, $a_{m,J}$ and $a_{m,J'}$ are non-zero vectors for all $m \in \bar{K} \setminus (J \cap J')$ by Lemma 6.5(ii). We choose a vector $b_{J,J'} \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ such that $\|b_{J,J'}\| \leq \|y_n\| + \|\tilde{y}_n\| + 1$ and $\langle a_{m,J}, y_n + b_{J,J'} \rangle \neq 0$ and $\langle a_{m,J'}, \tilde{y}_n + b_{J,J'} \rangle \neq 0$ for all $m \in \bar{K} \setminus (J \cap J')$. We let

$$1_{n,J}(y_n) = 1\{\Pi_{\Omega_n}(y_n + x_n \mid \Lambda^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n)) \in \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n))\},$$

and define $1_{n,J}(\tilde{y}_n)$ similarly, by replacing only y_n in $1_{n,J}(y_n)$ by \tilde{y}_n . Then, the desired sequence is constructed as

$$\tilde{x}_n = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)} \sum_{J' \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)} b_{J,J'} 1_{n,J}(y_n) 1_{n,J'}(\tilde{y}_n).$$

Since $|\mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)| \leq 2^K$, the sequence \tilde{x}_n is certainly bounded. We verify (35). For brevity we show only the first statement of (35). The proof of the second statement is similar.

Consider $J \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)$ such that $\Pi_{\Omega_n}(y_n + x_n \mid \Lambda^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n)) \in \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n))$, so that $\tilde{x}_n = b_{J,J'}$ for some $J' \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)$. Then, by Lemma 3.13.2 of [Silvapulle and Sen \(2005\)](#), we have

$$\Pi_{\Omega_n}(y_n + x_n \mid \Lambda^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n)) = \Pi_{\Omega_n}(y_n + x_n \mid L_J(\Omega_n)) = P_J(y_n + x_n).$$

Hence, for $m \in \bar{K}$,

$$[\pi_{\Omega_n}^\circ(y_n + x_n; w_n)]_m = \langle a_{m,J}, y_n + x_n \rangle.$$

Consider $m \in J$. By the definition of $L_J(\Omega_n)$, we have $\langle a_{m,J}, y_n + x_n \rangle = 0$, and this does not change if we replace x_n by any arbitrary vector. Consider $m \in \bar{K} \setminus J$. Since $J_0[\pi_{\Omega_n}^\circ(y_n + x_n; w_n)] = J$ by Lemma 6.1(iii), we must have for this m , $\langle a_{m,J}, x_n \rangle \neq -\langle a_{m,J}, y_n \rangle$. Hence, it suffices show that it is also true that for all $m \in \bar{K} \setminus J$, $\langle a_{m,J}, y_n + \tilde{x}_n \rangle \neq 0$, i.e., $\langle a_{m,J}, y_n + b_{J,J'} \rangle \neq 0$ in this case with J . However, this is true by our choice of $b_{J,J'}$. ■

Lemma 6.9. *Suppose that x_n is a sequence of vectors in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} , and Ω_n is a sequence of symmetric positive definite $(K-1) \times (K-1)$ matrices such that $\|x_n - x\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\Omega_n - \Omega\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for $x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$ and a symmetric positive definite matrix Ω . Suppose further that for each $J \subset \bar{K}$ such that $|J| < K-1$,*

$$(36) \quad |J_0[M\Pi_\Omega(x \mid L_J(\Omega))]| = |J|,$$

where $M = B_2\Omega^{-1}$.

Then, for any sequence $w_n \in \Delta_{K-1}$,

$$(37) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left| J_0[\pi_{\Omega_n}^\circ(x_n; w_n)] \right| - \left| J_0[\pi_\Omega^\circ(x; w_n)] \right| \right| = 0.$$

Proof: Recall that the relative interiors, $\text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n))$, $J \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)$, partition $\Lambda^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n)$. Hence,

$$\Lambda^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n) = \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)} \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w_n, \Omega_n)).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 6.1(ii) (iii), we have

$$J_0[\pi_{\Omega_n}^\circ(x_n; w_n)] \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n) \text{ and } J_0[\pi_\Omega^\circ(x; w_n)] \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega),$$

for all $n \geq 1$. For any $J \in 2^{\bar{K}}$, let $\mathcal{N}_J = \{n : J \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega_n)\}$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{N}'_J = \{n : J \in \mathcal{J}(w_n, \Omega)\}$. Let $\mathcal{J}_\infty \subset 2^{\bar{K}} \times 2^{\bar{K}}$ consist of pairs (J, J') such that $|\mathcal{N}_J \cap \mathcal{N}'_{J'}| = \infty$.

Take any subsequence of $\{n\}$. We will show the existence of a further subsequence along which the limit in (37) is zero. We choose $(J, J') \in \mathcal{J}_\infty$ together with a further subsequence $\{n'\}$ of $\mathcal{N}_J \cap \mathcal{N}'_{J'}$ such that along the subsequence,

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x_{n'} \mid \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'})) &\in \text{ri}(\Lambda_J^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'})) \text{ and} \\ \Pi_\Omega(x \mid \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega)) &\in \text{ri}(\Lambda_{J'}^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $J \in \mathcal{J}(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'})$ and $J' \in \mathcal{J}(w_{n'}, \Omega)$ for all n' in the subsequence, it follows from Lemma 6.1(iii) that

$$(39) \quad J_0[\pi_{\Omega_{n'}}^\circ(x_{n'}; w_{n'})] = J \text{ and } J_0[\pi_\Omega^\circ(x; w_{n'})] = J',$$

for all n' in the subsequence. We show that $|J| = |J'|$.

Suppose that $|J| = K - 1$. Then, by the Rank-Nullity theorem and Lemma 6.4,

$$\dim(L_J(\Omega_{n'})) = \text{nullity}([B_2 \Omega_{n'}^{-1}]_J) = \text{nullity}([B_2]_J) = K - 1 - |J| = 0.$$

Hence, $\Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x \mid L_J^\circ(\Omega_{n'})) = 0$ along the subsequence $\{n'\}$. Therefore,

$$J_0[\pi_{\Omega_{n'}}^\circ(x; w_{n'})] = \bar{K},$$

contradicting (39). Thus, $|J| \neq K - 1$, and similarly, $|J'| \neq K - 1$.

By the contractivity of the projection map and $0 \in \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'})$,

$$(40) \quad \begin{aligned} \limsup_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \|\Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x_{n'} \mid \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'}))\| &\leq \limsup_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Omega_{n'})} \|\Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x_{n'} \mid \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'}))\|_{\Omega_{n'}} \\ &\leq \limsup_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Omega_{n'})} \|x_{n'}\|_{\Omega_{n'}} = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\Omega)} \|x\|_\Omega < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

along the subsequence $\{n'\}$. (Here, $\lambda_{\max}(\Omega)$ denotes the maximum eigenvalue of Ω .) Now, note that

(41)

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x_{n'} | L_J(\Omega_{n'})) &= \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}; [B_2]_J \Omega_{n'}^{-1} y = 0} (y - x_{n'})' \Omega_{n'}^{-1} (y - x_{n'}) \\ &= \Omega_{n'} \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}; [B_2]_J y = 0} (y - \Omega_{n'}^{-1} x_{n'})' \Omega_{n'} (y - \Omega_{n'}^{-1} x_{n'}) \\ &= \Omega_{n'} \Pi_{\Omega_{n'}^{-1}}(\Omega_{n'}^{-1} x_{n'} | L_J(I_{K-1})) \rightarrow \Omega \Pi_{\Omega^{-1}}(\Omega^{-1} x | L_J(I_{K-1})) = \Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_J(\Omega)),\end{aligned}$$

where we use (40) and apply Lemma 6.7(ii). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x_{n'} | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'})) &= \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}; [B_2]_{J[w_{n'}]} \Omega_{n'}^{-1} y \leq 0} (y - x_{n'})' \Omega_{n'}^{-1} (y - x_{n'}) \\ &= \Omega_{n'} \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}; [B_2]_{J[w_{n'}]} y \leq 0} (y - \Omega_{n'}^{-1} x_{n'})' \Omega_{n'} (y - \Omega_{n'}^{-1} x_{n'}) \\ &= \Omega_{n'} \Pi_{\Omega_{n'}^{-1}}(\Omega_{n'}^{-1} x_{n'} | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, I_{K-1}))\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Omega_{n'} \Pi_{\Omega_{n'}^{-1}}(\Omega_{n'}^{-1} x_{n'} | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, I_{K-1})) - \Omega \Pi_{\Omega^{-1}}(\Omega^{-1} x | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, I_{K-1})) \rightarrow 0,$$

by Lemma 6.7(ii). Since $\Omega \Pi_{\Omega^{-1}}(\Omega^{-1} x | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, I_{K-1})) = \Pi_{\Omega}(x | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega))$, we have

$$(42) \quad \Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x_{n'} | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'})) - \Pi_{\Omega}(x | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega)) \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n' \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 3.13.2 of [Silvapulle and Sen \(2005\)](#) and (38), we find from (41) that

$$(43) \quad \begin{aligned}\Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x_{n'} | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega_{n'})) &= \Pi_{\Omega_{n'}}(x_{n'} | L_J^\circ(\Omega_{n'})) \rightarrow \Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_J^\circ(\Omega)), \text{ as } n' \rightarrow \infty, \text{ and} \\ \Pi_{\Omega}(x | \Lambda^\circ(w_{n'}, \Omega)) &= \Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_J^\circ(\Omega)).\end{aligned}$$

Combing this with (42), we find that

$$(44) \quad M \Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_J^\circ(\Omega)) = M \Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_{J'}^\circ(\Omega)).$$

Suppose that $|J| < K - 1$ and $|J'| < K - 1$. Then, by the condition (36), we find that $|J| = |J'|$. We also have $|J| = |J'|$ if both J and J' have cardinality equal to K .

Suppose that $|J'| < K - 1$ and $|J| = K$ so that by (36),

$$(45) \quad |J_0[M \Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_{J'}^\circ(\Omega))]| = |J'|,$$

and $\Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_J(\Omega)) = \Pi_{\Omega}(x | \{0\}) = 0$. From (44), we have $M \Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_{J'}^\circ(\Omega)) = 0$, or $J_0[M \Pi_{\Omega}(x | L_{J'}^\circ(\Omega))] = \bar{K}$. However, this contradicts (45). Hence, we cannot have $|J'| < K - 1$ and $|J| = K$. By symmetry of the arguments, we cannot have $|J| < K - 1$ and $|J'| = K$ either. Thus, we have proved that $|J| = |J'|$ for J, J' in (39). This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

6.2. Proofs of the Main Results

Proof of Lemma 3.1: Due to the almost sure representation theorem (cf. Theorem 6.7 of Billingsley (1999), p.70), there is a common probability space on which we have a sequence of random vectors \tilde{Z}_n and random matrices $\tilde{\Omega}_n$ such that

$$(46) \quad [\tilde{Z}'_n, \text{vec}(\tilde{\Omega}_n - \Omega_n)']' \rightarrow_{a.s.} [\tilde{Z}', 0']',$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where \tilde{Z}_n and $\tilde{\Omega}_n$ have the same distribution as Z_n and $\hat{\Omega}_n$, and \tilde{Z} has the same distribution as Z . Let

$$\tilde{Y}_n := \tilde{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \tilde{Z}_n + \mu_n \text{ and } \tilde{Y}_n^\infty := \tilde{\Omega}_n^{1/2} \tilde{Z} + \mu_n.$$

Clearly, $\Lambda(w_n)$ is a sequence of nonempty, closed and convex cones. By Lemma 6.7(i) and Assumption 3.1, we have

$$(47) \quad \left\| \tilde{Y}_n - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}(\tilde{Y}_n \mid \Lambda(w_n)) \right\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}^2 - \left\| \tilde{Y}_n^\infty - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}(\tilde{Y}_n^\infty \mid \Lambda(w_n)) \right\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}^2 \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us turn to the critical values. Since $\{\Omega_n\}$ is a bounded sequence of nonstochastic matrices whose minimum eigenvalues are uniformly bounded above zero, for any subsequence of $\{n\}$, there exists a further subsequence $\{n'\}$ such that $\Omega_{n'} \rightarrow \Omega$ for some positive definite matrix Ω . Consider the set of outcomes ω such that

$$\tilde{Z}_{n'}(\omega) \rightarrow \tilde{Z}(\omega), \quad \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}(\omega) \rightarrow \Omega,$$

and for each $J \subset \bar{K}$ such that $|J| < K - 1$,

$$\left| J_0 \left[M \Pi_\Omega(\Omega^{1/2} \tilde{Z}(\omega) + \mu \mid L_J(\Omega)) \right] \right| = |J|,$$

for all μ in \mathbf{Q}^{K-1} , where $M = B_2 \Omega^{-1}$. The set of such outcomes has probability 1 by Lemma 6.3.

For simplicity, let

$$\mathbf{z}_{n'} := \tilde{Z}_{n'}(\omega), \quad \mathbf{z} := \tilde{Z}(\omega), \quad \text{and } \Omega_{n'}^* := \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}(\omega).$$

Let us also define

$$y_{n'} := \Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z}_{n'} + \mu_{n'} \text{ and } y_{n'}^\infty := \Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z} + \mu_{n'}.$$

Since $\Omega_{n'}^*$ and $\mathbf{z}_{n'}$ converge, by Lemma 6.8, there exists a bounded sequence of vectors $\mu_{n'}^B$ such that for all $n' \geq 1$,

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega_{n'}^*}^\circ (\Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z}_{n'} + \mu_{n'}; w_{n'}) \right] &= J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega_{n'}^*}^\circ (\Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z}_{n'} + \mu_{n'}^B; w_{n'}) \right] \text{ and} \\ J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega_{n'}^*}^\circ (\Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z} + \mu_{n'}; w_{n'}) \right] &= J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega_{n'}^*}^\circ (\Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z} + \mu_{n'}^B; w_{n'}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$y_{n',B} := \Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z}_{n'} + \mu_{n'}^B \text{ and } y_{n',B}^\infty := \Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z} + \mu_{n'}^B.$$

Since the sequence $\mu_{n'}^B$ is bounded in \mathbf{R}^{K-1} , and both $\Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z}_{n'}$ and $\Omega_{n'}^{*1/2} \mathbf{z}$ converge to $\Omega^{1/2} \mathbf{z}$, for any subsequence of $\{n'\}$, there exists a further subsequence $\{n''\}$ along which

$$y_{n'',B} \rightarrow y_B \text{ and } y_{n'',B}^\infty \rightarrow y_B,$$

where $y_B = \Omega^{1/2} \mathbf{z} + \mu^B$ for some $\mu^B \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$. By choosing the subsequence judiciously, we can make μ^B belong to \mathbf{Q}^{K-1} . By Lemma 6.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left| J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega_{n''}^*}^\circ (y_{n'',B}; w_{n''}) \right] \right| - \left| J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega}^\circ (y_B; w_{n''}) \right] \right| \right| &= 0 \text{ and} \\ \lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left| J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega_{n''}^*}^\circ (y_{n'',B}^\infty; w_{n''}) \right] \right| - \left| J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega}^\circ (y_B; w_{n''}) \right] \right| \right| &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, combining this with (48), we find that

$$\lim_{n'' \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left| J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega_{n''}^*}^\circ (y_{n''}; w_{n''}) \right] \right| - \left| J_0 \left[\pi_{\Omega_{n''}^*}^\circ (y_{n''}^\infty; w_{n''}) \right] \right| \right| = 0.$$

Since the number of zeros in a finite dimensional vector takes values from a finite set, there exists n_0 such that for all $n'' \geq n_0$ in the subsequence $\{n''\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{1-\alpha, \Omega_{n''}^*} (y_{n''}; w_{n''}) &= G^{-1} \left(1 - \alpha; \max \left\{ K - 1 - |J_0[\pi_{\Omega_{n''}^*}^\circ (y_{n''}; w_{n''})]|, 1 \right\} \right) \\ &= G^{-1} \left(1 - \alpha; \max \left\{ K - 1 - |J_0[\pi_{\Omega_{n''}^*}^\circ (y_{n''}^\infty; w_{n''})]|, 1 \right\} \right) = c_{1-\alpha, \Omega_{n''}^*} (y_{n''}^\infty; w_{n''}), \end{aligned}$$

as $n'' \rightarrow \infty$. From this, combined with (47), we conclude that with probability one, for any subsequence of $\{n\}$, there exists a further subsequence $\{n'\}$ along which

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left\| \tilde{Y}_{n'} - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'} \mid \Lambda(w_{n'})) \right\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 - c_{1-\alpha, \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'}; w_{n'}) \\ &\quad - \left(\left\| \tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty \mid \Lambda(w_{n'})) \right\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 - c_{1-\alpha, \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty; w_{n'}) \right) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\tilde{\delta}_n := \max \left\{ K - 1 - \left| J_0 \left[\pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_n}^\circ (\tilde{Y}_n^\infty; w_n) \right] \right|, 1 \right\}.$$

There exists a continuous map $\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \eta(x) = 0$ and for any $\epsilon > 0$ such that $0 < \eta(\epsilon) < \alpha$,

$$G^{-1}(1 - \alpha - \eta(\epsilon); \tilde{\delta}_n) \leq G^{-1}(1 - \alpha; \tilde{\delta}_n) - \epsilon, \text{ for all } n \geq 1,$$

almost everywhere, where η is chosen to be independent of ω , because $1 \leq \tilde{\delta}_n \leq K-1$. Hence, for any $\epsilon > 0$ such that $0 < \eta(\epsilon) < \alpha$, and for any subsequence of $\{n\}$, there exists a further subsequence $\{n'\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \left\| \tilde{Y}_{n'} - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'} \mid \Lambda(w_{n'})) \right\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 - c_{1-\alpha, \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'}; w_{n'}) > 0 \right\} \\ & \leq \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \left\| \tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty \mid \Lambda(w_{n'})) \right\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 - (c_{1-\alpha, \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty; w_{n'}) - \epsilon) > 0 \right\} \\ & \leq \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \left\| \tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty - \Pi_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty \mid \Lambda(w_{n'})) \right\|_{\tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}^2 - c_{1-\alpha-\eta(\epsilon), \tilde{\Omega}_{n'}}(\tilde{Y}_{n'}^\infty; w_{n'}) > 0 \right\} \leq \alpha + \eta(\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from Lemma 6.6. By sending $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, we obtain the desired statement of the lemma. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.1: First, note that for $w \in \Delta_{K-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(w) &= \left| J_0 \left[B_2 \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) (\hat{f}(w) - B_2' \hat{\lambda}(w)) \right] \right| \\ &= \left| J_0 \left[B_2 \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) (\hat{f}(w) - \Pi_{\hat{\Omega}(w)}(\hat{f}(w) \mid \Lambda(w))) \right] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $x = \Pi_{\Omega}(x \mid \Lambda(w)) + \Pi_{\Omega}(x \mid \Lambda^\circ(w, \Omega))$ for any $x \in \mathbf{R}^{K-1}$, the last term is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| J_0 \left[B_2 \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) \Pi_{\hat{\Omega}(w)}(\hat{f}(w) \mid \Lambda^\circ(w, \hat{\Omega}(w))) \right] \right| \\ &= \left| J_0 \left[B_2 \hat{\Omega}^{-1}(w) \Pi_{\hat{\Omega}(w)}(\sqrt{n} \hat{f}(w) \mid \Lambda^\circ(w, \hat{\Omega}(w))) \right] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of $c_{1-\alpha, \Omega}(\cdot; w)$ in (23), we can write

$$\hat{c}_{1-\alpha}(w) = c_{1-\alpha, \hat{\Omega}(w)}(\sqrt{n} \hat{f}(w); w).$$

It suffices to show the following: along any sequence $P_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{w \in \mathbb{W}_{P_n}} P_n \left\{ T(w) > c_{1-\alpha, \hat{\Omega}(w)}(\sqrt{n} \hat{f}(w); w) \right\} \leq \alpha.$$

By the definition of the supremum, there exists a sequence $w_n \in \mathbb{W}_{P_n}$ such that the limit on the left hand side is equal to

$$(50) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n \left\{ T(w_n) > c_{1-\alpha, \hat{\Omega}(w_n)}(\sqrt{n} \hat{f}(w_n); w_n) \right\}.$$

We apply Lemma 3.1 by setting

$$Y_n = \sqrt{n} \hat{f}(w_n), \quad Z_n = \hat{\Omega}_n^{-1/2}(Y_n - \mu_n), \quad \Omega_n = \Omega_{P_n}(w_n), \quad \text{and } \mu_n = \sqrt{n} f_{P_n}(w_n),$$

where $\hat{\Omega}_n = \hat{\Omega}(w_n)$. By Assumption 3.2, Assumption 3.1 is satisfied. Thus, the limit in (50) is bounded by α by Lemma 3.1. ■

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, COVENTRY, CV4 7AL, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: nathan.canen@warwick.ac.uk

VANCOUVER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 6000 IONA DRIVE, VANCOUVER, BC,
V6T 1L4, CANADA

Email address: kysong@mail.ubc.ca