

# Testing degree heterogeneity in directed networks

Lu Pan\* Qiuping Wang<sup>†</sup> Ting Yan<sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

We are concerned with the likelihood ratio tests in the  $p_0$  model for testing degree heterogeneity in directed networks. It is an exponential family distribution on directed graphs with the out-degree sequence and the in-degree sequence as naturally sufficient statistics. For two growing dimensional null hypotheses: a specified null  $H_0 : \theta_i = \theta_i^0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and a homogenous null  $H_0 : \theta_1 = \dots = \theta_r$ , we reveal high dimensional Wilks' phenomena that the normalized log-likelihood ratio statistic,  $[2\{\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\} - r]/(2r)^{1/2}$ , converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . Here,  $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is the log-likelihood function,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  is the unrestricted maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  is the restricted MLE for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  under the null  $H_0$ . For the homogenous null  $H_0 : \theta_1 = \dots = \theta_r$  with a fixed  $r$ , we establish the Wilks-type theorem that  $2\{\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\}$  converges in distribution to a chi-square distribution with  $r - 1$  degrees of freedom as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , not depending on the nuisance parameters. These results extend a recent work by Yan et al. (2023) to directed graphs. Simulation studies and real data analyses illustrate the theoretical results.

**Key words:** Degree heterogeneity, Directed graphs, Likelihood ratio tests, Wilks-type theorems.

## 1 Introduction

The degree heterogeneity is a very common phenomenon in real-world networks, which describes variation in degrees of nodes. In directed networks, there are an out-degree

---

\*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shangqiu Normal University, Shangqiu, 476000, China. Email: panlulu@mails.cnu.edu.cn

<sup>†</sup>School of Mathematics and Statistics, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing, 526000, China. Email: qp.wang@mails.cnu.edu.cn.

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Statistics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, 430079, China. Email: tingyanty@mail.cnu.edu.cn.

and an in-degree for a node, which are the number of outgoing edges from that node and the number of ingoing edges pointing to that node, respectively. The  $p_0$  model (Yan et al., 2016; Yan, 2021) can be used to describe the degree heterogeneity in directed networks. It is an exponential random graph model with the out-degree sequence and the in-degree sequence as naturally sufficient statistics. Specifically, it assumes that all edges are independent and the random edge  $a_{i,j}$  between nodes  $i$  and  $j$  is distributed as a Bernoulli random variable with the edge probability

$$\mathbb{P}(a_{i,j} = 1) = \frac{e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j}}{1 + e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j}}. \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha_i$  represents the outgoingness parameter of node  $i$  quantifying the effect of an outgoing edge and  $\beta_j$  denotes the popularity parameter of node  $j$  quantifying the effect of an incoming edge. The  $p_0$  model is a version of an earlier  $p_1$  model (Holland and Leinhardt, 1981) without the reciprocity parameter.

Since the number of parameters increases with the number of nodes in the  $p_0$  model. Statistical inferences are non-standard and turn out to be challenging (Goldenberg et al., 2010; Fienberg, 2012). Yan et al. (2016) established consistency and the asymptotically normal distribution of the MLE when the number of nodes goes to infinity. However, likelihood ratio tests (LRTs) are not investigated in their study. It is of often interest to test degree heterogeneity amongst a subset of nodes, although most of real network data indeed show degree heterogeneity. The LRTs are powerful tools to solve this problem. Holland and Leinhardt (1981) made the conjecture of a chi-square approximation when testing the reciprocity parameter in the  $p_1$  model. Fienberg and Wasserman (1981) suggested a normal approximation for the scaled LRTs under the null that all out-degree parameters (in-degree parameters) are equal to zero. However, these conjectures have not been resolved.

Likelihood ratio theory has tremendous successes in parametric hypothesis testing problems due to the celebrated theory of the Wilks theorem [Wilks (1938)]. It says that the minus twice log-likelihood ratio test statistic under the null converges in distribution to a chi-square distribution, independent of nuisance parameters. If such property holds in high dimension settings, Fan et al. (2001) called it the Wilks phenomenon. Motivated by Yan et al. (2023) who revealed Wilks-type theorems under increasing and fixed dimensional null hypotheses in the  $\beta$ -model (Chatterjee et al., 2011) for undirected graph and the Bradley–Terry model (Bradley and Terry, 1952) for paired comparisons, we aim to investigate whether such results continue to hold in the  $p_0$  model.

Our contributions are as follows. First, for two increasing dimensional null hypotheses  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ , we show that the null distribution of the normalized log-likelihood ratio statistic,  $[2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\} - r]/(2r)^{1/2}$ , converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\alpha_i^0$  are known numbers. Here,  $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is the log-likelihood function,  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  is the unrestricted MLE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  is the restricted MLE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  under  $H_0$ . In other words,  $2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\}$  is asymptotically a chi-square distribution with a large degree  $r$  of freedom. Second, for a fixed  $r$ , under the homogenous null  $H_0: \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ , we prove that  $2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\}$  converges to a chi-square distribution with  $r - 1$  degrees of freedom as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . That says the LRT behaves like classical ones as long as the difference between the dimension of the full space and the dimension of the null space is fixed. Our proof strategies apply the principled methods developed in [Yan et al. \(2023\)](#), which demonstrates their methods can be extended into other models. These results also demonstrate the conjectures of a chi-square approximation when testing a single parameter in [Holland and Leinhardt \(1981\)](#) and a normal approximation when testing a large number of parameters in [Fienberg and Wasserman \(1981\)](#) when there is no reciprocity parameter in the  $p_1$  model. Third, when testing  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$  with a fixed  $r$ , a different phenomenon is discovered, in which  $2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\}$  does not follow asymptotically a chi-square distribution as observed in [Yan et al. \(2023\)](#) for the Bradley–Terry model. Simulation studies and several real data analysis illustrate our theoretical results.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the Wilks-type theorems for the  $p_0$  model. Simulation studies and several real data analysis are given in Section 3. Some further discussions are given in Section 4. Section 5 presents the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. The supported lemmas are relegated to the Supplemental Material.

## 2 Main results

Consider a simple directed graph  $\mathcal{G}_n$  with  $n$  nodes labelled as “1, ...,  $n$ ”. Let  $A = (a_{i,j})_{\{1 \leq i,j \leq n\}} \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$  be its adjacency matrix, where  $a_{i,j} = 1$  if there exists a directed edge from  $i$  to  $j$ ; otherwise,  $a_{i,j} = 0$ . We assume that there are no self-loops, i.e.,  $a_{i,i} = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let  $d_i = \sum_{j \neq i} a_{i,j}$  be the out-degree of node  $i$  and  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)^\top$  the out-degree sequence of the graph  $\mathcal{G}_n$ . Similarly, let  $b_j = \sum_{i \neq j} a_{i,j}$  be the in-degree of node  $j$  and  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)^\top$  the in-degree sequence. The pair  $(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{b})$  is referred to as the bi-degree sequence.

The  $p_0$  model postulates that all  $a_{i,j}, 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ , are mutually independent

Bernoulli random variables with edge probabilities given in (1). Let  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^\top$  and  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)^\top$ . Owing to the fact that  $\sum_i d_i = \sum_j b_j$ , the probability distribution is invariant under the transforms  $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$  to  $(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - c, \boldsymbol{\beta} + c)$  for a constant  $c$ . For the identification of the  $p_0$  model, we set

$$\beta_n = 0. \quad (2)$$

The log-likelihood function under the  $p_0$  model can be written as

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i d_i + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \beta_j b_j - \sum_{i \neq j} \log(1 + e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j}),$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$ . The likelihood equations are

$$\begin{aligned} d_i &= \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{e^{\hat{\alpha}_i + \hat{\beta}_j}}{1 + e^{\hat{\alpha}_i + \hat{\beta}_j}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ b_j &= \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{e^{\hat{\alpha}_i + \hat{\beta}_j}}{1 + e^{\hat{\alpha}_i + \hat{\beta}_j}}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_n, \hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{n-1})^\top$  is the MLE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  with  $\hat{\beta}_n = 0$ . The fixed point iteration algorithm or frequency iterative algorithm in [Holland and Leinhardt \(1981\)](#) can be used to solve the above equations. We present the fixed point iteration algorithm in [Algorithm 1](#) when testing  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0, \quad i = 1, \dots, r$ .

We use  $V$  to denote the Hessian matrix of the negative log-likelihood function, and the elements of  $V (= (v_{i,j})_{(2n-1) \times (2n-1)})$  are

$$\begin{aligned} v_{i,i} &= \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j})^2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ v_{n+j, n+j} &= \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j})^2}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ v_{i,j} &= 0, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, i \neq j, \\ v_{i,j} &= 0, \quad i, j = n+1, \dots, 2n-1, i \neq j, \\ v_{i, n+j} &= v_{n+j, i} = \frac{e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j})^2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, n-1, j \neq i, \\ v_{i, n+i} &= v_{n+i, i} = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that  $V$  is also the Fisher information matrix of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and the covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{g} = (d_1, \dots, d_n, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1})^\top$ . We define two notations that play important roles on

---

**Algorithm 1** Restricted MLE under a specified null  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$

---

**Require:** the adjacency matrix  $A = (a_{i,j}), r, \epsilon$ .

1: Initialize:  $\alpha^{(0)} = (\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_r^0, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_n), \beta^{(0)}, k = 0, d_i = \sum_{i \neq j} a_{i,j}, b_j = \sum_{i \neq j} a_{i,j}$

2: **While** TRUE **do**

3:   **for**  $i$  in  $1 : n$  **do**

$$4: \quad \alpha_i^{(k+1)} = \log d_i - \log \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{e^{\beta_j^{(k)}}}{1 + e^{\alpha_i^{(k)} + \beta_j^{(k)}}}$$

5:   **end for**

6:   **for**  $j$  in  $1 : n$  **do**

$$7: \quad \beta_j^{(k+1)} = \log b_j - \log \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{e^{\alpha_i^{(k)}}}{1 + e^{\alpha_i^{(k)} + \beta_j^{(k)}}}$$

8:   **end for**

9: Let  $\alpha_i^{(k+1)} = (\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_r^0, \alpha_{r+1}^{(k+1)}, \dots, \alpha_n^{(k+1)})$ ,  $y_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{e^{\alpha_i^{(k+1)} + \beta_j^{(k+1)}}}{1 + e^{\alpha_i^{(k+1)} + \beta_j^{(k+1)}}} / d_i, i = r + 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$z_j = \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{e^{\alpha_i^{(k+1)} + \beta_j^{(k+1)}}}{1 + e^{\alpha_i^{(k+1)} + \beta_j^{(k+1)}}} / b_j, j = 1, \dots, n$$

10: **If**  $\max(\max_i (|y_i - 1|), \max_j (|z_j - 1|)) > \epsilon$  **then**

11:   Turn to line 3

12: **end for**

13: **If**  $\max(\max_i (|y_i - 1|), \max_j (|z_j - 1|)) < \epsilon$  **then**

14:   Break

15: **end for**

16:    $k = k + 1$

17: **end while**

18: Return  $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha^{(k)}, \hat{\beta} = \beta^{(k)}$

---

guaranteeing good properties of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ :

$$b_n = \max_{i,j} \frac{(1 + e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j})^2}{e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j}}, \quad c_n = \min_{i,j} \frac{(1 + e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j})^2}{e^{\alpha_i + \beta_j}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $b_n^{-1}$  and  $c_n^{-1}$  are equal to the minimum and maximum variances of  $a_{i,j}$  over  $i \neq j$ , and  $c_n \geq 4$ .

We assume that the random adjacency matrix  $A$  is generated under the model with the parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . We consider a specified null  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ , where  $\alpha_i^0$  are known numbers, and a homogeneous null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ . Then the log-likelihood ratio is  $2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\}$ , where  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  denotes the restricted MLE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  under the null parameter space. Theorem 1 presents the Wilks-type theorems for testing specified and homogenous null hypotheses with an increasing dimension.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose  $b_n^{15}/c_n^{12} = o(r^{1/2}/(\log n)^2)$ .*

- (a) *Under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$ , as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , the log-likelihood ratio statistic  $2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\}$  is asymptotically normally distributed in the sense that*

$$(2r)^{-1/2}(2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\} - r) \xrightarrow{L} N(0, 1), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (6)$$

where  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0 = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\Theta_0 = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-1}, (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r) = (\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_r^0)\}$ .

- (b) *Under the homogenous null  $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_0 = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-1}, \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r\}$ , the normalized log-likelihood ratio statistic in (6) also converges in distribution to the standard normal distribution.*

The condition in Theorem 1 restricts the increasing rate of  $b_n$ . When all parameters are bounded above by a constant, the condition automatically holds. When  $b_n \asymp c_n$ , the condition in Theorem 1 becomes  $b_n = o(r^{1/6}/(\log n)^{2/3})$ .

Next, we present the Wilks-type theorem under the homogenous testing problem with a fixed dimension.

**Theorem 2.** *If  $b_n^{21}/c_n^{17} = o(n^{1/2}/(\log n)^{5/2})$ , under the homogenous null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$  with a fixed  $r$ , the log-likelihood ratio statistic  $2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\}$  converges in distribution to a chi-square distribution with  $r - 1$  degrees of freedom.*

The above Theorem does not cover a fixed dimensional specified null  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$ , unlike Theorem 1 containing both specified and homogenous null hypotheses. In fact, the Wilks-type result does not hold when testing  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$ . Some

explanations are as follows. With the use of  $S_{22}$  defined in (9) to approximate  $V_{22}^{-1}$  and similar arguments as in the proof of (19) and (32), we have

$$2 \left\{ \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0) \right\} = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\bar{d}_i^2}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{\bar{b}_n^2}{v_{2n,2n}} - \frac{(\bar{b}_n - \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i)^2}{\tilde{v}_{2n,2n}} + \frac{1}{3}(B_2 - B_2^0) + \frac{1}{12}(B_3 - B_3^0),$$

where  $(B_2 - B_2^0)$  is the difference of the third-order expansion term of the log-likelihood function between the full space and the null space, and  $(B_3 - B_3^0)$  is the corresponding difference of the fourth-order expansion term. Here,  $B_2 - B_2^0$  does not vanish. A crucial quantity to measure  $B_2 - B_2^0$  is  $\max_{i=r+1, \dots, 2n-1} |\widehat{\theta}_i - \widehat{\theta}_i^0|$ , where the differences under the specified null are represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\alpha}_i - \widehat{\alpha}_i^0 &= \frac{\bar{b}_n}{v_{2n,2n}} - \frac{\bar{b}_n - \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i}{\tilde{v}_{2n,2n}} + O_p \left( \frac{b_n^9 \log n}{nc_n^7} \right), \quad i = r+1, \dots, n, \\ \widehat{\beta}_j - \widehat{\beta}_j^0 &= -\frac{\bar{b}_n}{v_{2n,2n}} + \frac{\bar{b}_n - \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i}{\tilde{v}_{2n,2n}} + O_p \left( \frac{b_n^9 \log n}{nc_n^7} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1, \end{aligned}$$

The difference of two distributions of  $\frac{\bar{b}_n}{v_{2n,2n}}$  and  $\frac{\bar{b}_n - \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i}{\tilde{v}_{2n,2n}}$  is much larger than the order of  $\log n/n$ . Under the homogenous null, the off-diagonal elements are the same as the approximate inverse for approximating  $V^{-1}$  in the full parameter space. This means that the difference between the two terms above is not contained in  $\widehat{\theta}_i - \widehat{\theta}_i^0$ . It leads to that  $B_2 - B_2^0$  vanishes in the homogenous null but remaining in the specified null. As a result, the Wilks type of result does not hold in the fixed dimensional specified null.

We plot the density curve of  $2 \left\{ \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0) \right\}$  against the chi-square distribution to provide some understanding on the distribution under the specified null. We consider three specified nulls: (i)  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = 0$ ; (ii)  $H_0 : (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (0, 0)$ ; (iii)  $H_0 : (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (0.1, 0.2)$ . The other parameters are as follows: let  $\beta_i = \alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_i = 0.1(i-1) \log n / (n-1)$ . The simulation is run 5,000 times, and the plots are shown in Figure 1. As we can see, the distribution is far away from chi-square distributions with degree 1, 2 nor 3.

**Remark 1.** Theorem 1 and 2 only give the Wilks-type result under  $H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ . About testing  $H_0 : \beta_i = \beta_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $H_0 : \beta_1 = \dots = \beta_r$ , we have the similar result.




Figure 1: Comparisons of density curves between LRT and chi-square distributions with degrees 1, 2 or 3 of freedom ( $n=200$ ).

### 3 Numerical experiments

#### 3.1 Simulation studies

We carry out simulations to evaluate the performance of the log-likelihood ratio statistics via finite sizes of networks. We consider three null hypotheses:

- (i)  $H_{01}$ :  $\alpha_i = (i - 1)L_n/(n - 1)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- (ii)  $H_{02}$ :  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ ,  $r = n/2$ ;
- (iii)  $H_{03}$ :  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$  with a fixed  $r$ ;


where  $L_n$  is used to control different asymptotic regimes. We choose three values for  $L_n$ :  $L_n = 0$ ,  $0.1 \log n$  or  $0.2 \log n$ . Under  $H_{02}$  and  $H_{03}$ , we set the left  $n - r$  parameters as:  $\alpha_i = (i - 1)L_n/(n - 1)$  for  $i = r + 1, \dots, n$ . For simplicity, we set  $\beta_i = \alpha_i$  as in Yan et al. (2016) and Yan (2021) and  $\beta_n = 0$ .  $H_{01}$  aims to test a specified null.  $H_{02}$  and  $H_{03}$  aim to test whether a given set of parameters with increasing or fixed dimensions are equal. For homogenous null  $H_{02}$  and  $H_{03}$ , we set  $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r = 0$ . We consider  $n = 100, 200$  or  $n = 500$ . Under each simulation setting, 5,000 datasets are generated.

We draw QQ-plots to evaluate the asymptotic distributions of the log-likelihood ratio statistics. Owing to the limited space, we only show plots of quantiles of chi-square distributions or standard normal distributions vs sample quantiles in the case of  $n = 500$  under  $H_{01}$ . Other plots including those in the case of  $n = 100$  or  $n = 200$  are in the Supplementary Material. Figure 2 (a) and (b) show the results of the normal approximation of the normalized LRT and the chi-square approximation of the LRT under  $H_{01}$ , respectively. The sample quantiles agree well with theoretical quantiles except for there are only slight deviations from the reference line  $y = x$  in the tail of curves for the normalized LRT.


We also record the Type I errors under two nominal levels  $\tau_1 = 0.05$  and  $\tau_2 = 0.1$ , shown in Table 1. From this table, we can see that the simulated Type I errors are very



Figure 2: QQ plots under  $H_{01}$  ( $n=500$ ). The horizontal and vertical axes in each QQ-plot are the respective theoretical and empirical quantiles. The straight lines correspond to  $y = x$ .



(a) QQ-plots for normalized log-likelihood ratio statistics



(b) QQ-plots for log-likelihood ratio statistics

close to the nominal level. For instance, the largest relative difference  $(a - b)/a$  is 0.084 when  $n = 200$  under  $H_{01}$ , where  $a$  denotes the normal level and  $b$  the simulated Type I error.

Next, we compare the powers of the log-likelihood ratio tests and the Wald-type test statistics for fixed dimensional null hypotheses  $H_0: \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ . Following [Yan et al. \(2016\)](#), the Wald-type test statistic can be constructed as follows:

Table 1: Simulated type I errors ( $\times 100$ ) of the LRTs under two nominal levels:  $\tau_1 = 0.05$ ,  $\tau_2 = 0.1$

NULL	$n$	Normal Level	$c = 0$	$c = 0.1$	$c = 0.2$
$H_{01}$	100	$\tau_1$	4.92	5.06	5.30
		$\tau_2$	9.92	10.36	10.36
	200	$\tau_1$	5.42	5.12	5.18
		$\tau_2$	10.42	10.82	10.08
	500	$\tau_1$	5.20	5.20	5.14
		$\tau_2$	10.68	10.14	9.98
$H_{02}$	100	$\tau_1$	5.06	5.40	5.46
		$\tau_2$	9.96	10.26	11.02
	200	$\tau_1$	5.32	5.52	4.26
		$\tau_2$	10.32	10.58	9.66
	500	$\tau_1$	6.00	4.90	4.48
		$\tau_2$	10.42	9.90	9.42
$H_{03}$	100	$\tau_1$	4.74	5.44	5.14
		$\tau_2$	10.16	10.50	10.26
	200	$\tau_1$	4.80	4.74	5.18
		$\tau_2$	10.52	9.40	9.88
	500	$\tau_1$	5.22	5.24	5.54
		$\tau_2$	10.40	9.90	9.98

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2 \\ \hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_3 \\ \dots \\ \hat{\alpha}_{r-1} - \hat{\alpha}_r \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{11}} + \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{22}} & -\frac{1}{\hat{v}_{22}} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\hat{v}_{22}} & \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{22}} + \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{33}} & -\frac{1}{\hat{v}_{33}} & \dots & 0 \\ & & \vdots & & \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & -\frac{1}{\hat{v}_{r-1,r-1}} & \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{r-1,r-1}} + \frac{1}{\hat{v}_{rr}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2 \\ \hat{\alpha}_2 - \hat{\alpha}_3 \\ \dots \\ \hat{\alpha}_{r-1} - \hat{\alpha}_r \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

The true model is set to be  $\alpha_i = ic/r$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . The other parameters are set as  $\alpha_i = 0.2i \log n/n$  for  $i = r+1, \dots, n$  and  $\beta_i = 0.2i \log n/n$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$  with  $\beta_n = 0$ . The simulated results are shown in Table 2 with the nominal level 0.05. When  $H_0$  (i.e.,  $c = 0$ ) is true, the powers are close to the nominal level as expected. Furthermore, when  $n$  and  $r$  are fixed, the power tends to increase with  $c$  and approaches 100% when  $c = 1.3$ . When  $n$  and  $c$  are fixed while  $r$  increases, a similar phenomena can be seen. The power tends to grow with  $n$  increases when  $c$  and  $r$  are fixed.

### 3.2 Testing degree heterogeneity in real-world data

We apply likelihood ratio statistics to test degree heterogeneity in three real-world network data sets, which are the email-Eu-core network (Yin et al., 2017), the UC Irvine

Table 2: Comparison between powers of the LRTs and the Wald-type tests in parentheses.

$n$	$r$	$c = 0$	$c = 0.2$	$c = 0.4$	$c = 0.7$	$c = 1.0$	$c = 1.3$
100	5	5.76(5.58)	5.74(5.34)	9.56(8.8)	24.52(22.24)	46.04(43.62)	70.8(67.8)
	10	5.86(5.58)	6.8(6.36)	11.68(10.96)	38.52(36.7)	72.6(70.96)	93.26(92.5)
200	5	4.90(4.78)	7.08(6.82)	15(14.82)	47.8(46.96)	81.98(81.44)	96.54(96.16)
	10	4.66(4.50)	7.18(6.80)	22(21.12)	74.1(73.48)	97.78(97.66)	99.98(99.96)
500	5	5.22(5.24)	10.4(10.36)	40.22(39.9)	92.36(92.14)	100(99.76)	100(100)
	10	5.46(5.38)	13.98(13.62)	63.04(62.78)	99.54(99.52)	100(100)	100(100)

messages network (Opsahl and Panzarasa, 2009) and the US airports network (Kunegis, 2013). All these three networks are openly available, where the first one can be download from <https://snap.stanford.edu/data/email-Eu-core.html> and the latter two from <http://www.konect.cc/networks>.

The email-Eu-core network consists of 1, 005 nodes and 25, 571 directed edges, where a node denotes a member in a European research institution. A directed edge between two members represents who sent an email to whom at least once. The UC Irvine messages network consists of 1, 899 nodes, where a node represents a user. The original data is also weighted. Here, we transform it into an unweighted network, where a directed edge between two users denotes who sent a message to whom at least once. A total of 20, 296 directed edges are generated. The US airports network illustrates the flight connections between 1, 574 US airports. The original data is weighted. Here, we treated it as an unweighted network, where a directed edge denotes there are a flight from one airport to another at least once. As a result, there are a total of 28, 236 directed edges.

We aim to test whether there is degree heterogeneity in the subsets of nodes with the  $r$  largest id number. Table 3 reports p-values for testing  $H_{01} : \alpha_{n-r+1} = \dots = \alpha_n$  or  $H_{02} : \beta_{n-r+1} = \dots = \beta_{n-1}$ , where  $\beta_n = 0$  is the condition for model identification. As we can see, in the email-Eu-core data, the p-value is not significant when testing  $\alpha_{n-1} = \alpha_n$  while it starts to become significant when  $r \geq 5$ . When  $r$  increases to 10, it is very significant, indicating a strong evidence for out-degree heterogeneity. For testing in-degree heterogeneity, it is not significant when  $r = 5$  while it is very significant when  $r = 10$ . The similar phenomenon can also observed in the UC Irvine Messages, except that it needs a little larger  $r$  to detect degree heterogeneity. However, the US airports data exhibit a different phenomenon. When testing  $H_{01}$  or  $H_{02}$  with  $r = 10, 20, 50, 100, 200, 300$ , the p-values are all not significant, indicating that there are no degree heterogeneity in a large set of nodes. When  $r$  increases to 400, the p-value becomes significant. Further, the p-values under  $r = 500$  is much less than those under  $r = 400$ . These results show the degree heterogeneity is a common phenomenon and varies across different sets of nodes

in different data sets.

Table 3: Testing degree heterogeneity in several network data sets.

Data set	$\alpha$		$\beta$	
	$r$	p-value	$r$	p-value
email-Eu-core	2	0.62	5	0.19
	5	0.02	10	$< 10^{-5}$
	10	$< 10^{-5}$	50	$< 10^{-5}$
UC Irvine messages	5	0.28	10	0.44
	10	$7 \times 10^{-3}$	20	0.08
	50	$< 10^{-5}$	50	$< 10^{-5}$
US airports	300	0.82	300	0.89
	400	$8 \times 10^{-5}$	400	$8 \times 10^{-4}$
	500	$< 10^{-5}$	500	$< 10^{-5}$

## 4 Discussion

We study asymptotic behaviors of LRTs in the  $p_0$  model. The Wilks type of results have been established for fixed and increasing dimensional parameter hypothesis testing problems. It is worth noting that the conditions imposed on  $b_n$  and  $c_n$  could not be the optimal ones. Even in cases where these prerequisites are not met, the simulation results show that there are still reasonable asymptotic approximations. It is crucial to note that the asymptotic behaviors of likelihood ratio statistics are influenced not only by  $b_n$  (or  $c_n$ ) but also by the entire configuration of parameters.

Our current study focuses on binary edges. There is potential to extend the edge generation scheme from Bernoulli to Poisson, where the probability of an edge between nodes  $i$  and  $j$  is given by  $p(a_{i,j}) = e^{x(\alpha_i + \beta_j)} / x! \cdot e^{-e^{(\alpha_i + \beta_j)}}$ ,  $x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . The idea is very similar to how [Yan et al. \(2016\)](#) extended the ordinary  $\beta$ -model from Bernoulli to Poisson and many other general edge distributions. We leave the detailed formulation and theoretical study to future work.

## 5 Appendix

We introduce some notations. For a vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let  $\|\mathbf{x}\|$  be a general norm on vectors with the special cases  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|$  and  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = \sum_i |x_i|$  for the  $\ell_\infty$ - and  $\ell_1$ -norm of  $\mathbf{x}$  respectively. For an  $n \times n$  matrix  $J = (J_{ij})$ ,  $\|J\|_\infty$  denotes the

matrix norm induced by the  $\ell_\infty$ -norm on vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , i.e.,

$$\|J\|_\infty = \max_{\mathbf{x} \neq 0} \frac{\|J\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^n |J_{ij}|,$$

and  $\|J\|$  is a general matrix norm.  $\|J\|_{\max}$  denotes the maximum absolute entry-wise norm, i.e.,  $\|J\|_{\max} = \max_{i,j} |J_{ij}|$ . The notation  $f(n) = O(g(n))$  or  $f(n) \lesssim g(n)$  means there is a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $|f(n)| \leq c|g(n)|$ .  $f(n) \asymp g(n)$  means that  $f(n) \lesssim g(n)$  and  $g(n) \lesssim f(n)$ .  $f(n) = o(g(n))$  means  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n)/g(n) = 0$ .

Define two matrices  $S(= (s_{i,j})_{(2n-1) \times (2n-1)})$

$$s_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{\delta_{i,j}}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}}, & i, j = 1, \dots, n, \\ -\frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}}, & i = 1, \dots, n, j = n+1, \dots, 2n-1, \\ -\frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}}, & i = n+1, \dots, 2n-1, j = 1, \dots, n, \\ \frac{\delta_{i,j}}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}}, & i, j = n+1, \dots, 2n-1, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and  $S_{22}(= (s_{i,j})_{(2n-1-r) \times (2n-1-r)})$

$$s_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{\delta_{i,j}}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{1}{\tilde{v}_{2n,2n}}, & i, j = r+1, \dots, n, \\ -\frac{1}{\tilde{v}_{2n,2n}}, & i = r+1, \dots, n, j = n+1, \dots, 2n-1, \\ -\frac{1}{\tilde{v}_{2n,2n}}, & i = n+1, \dots, 2n-1, j = r+1, \dots, n, \\ \frac{\delta_{i,j}}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{1}{\tilde{v}_{2n,2n}}, & i, j = n+1, \dots, 2n-1, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where  $\tilde{v}_{2n,2n} = \sum_{i=r+1}^{2n-1} \tilde{v}_{i,2n} = \sum_{i=r+1}^n v_{i,2n} + \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n-1} \sum_{j=1}^r v_{i,j}$  and  $\delta_{i,j}$  is the Kronecker delta function. Yan et al. (2016) proposed to use the matrix  $S$  to approximate  $V^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 1.** For  $V \in \mathcal{L}_n(1/b_n, 1/c_n)$  with  $n \geq 2$  and its bottom right  $(2n-1-r) \times (2n-1-r)$  block  $V_{22}$  with  $r \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , if

$$\frac{(n-r)m}{(n-1)rM} = o(1),$$

we have

$$\max\{\|V^{-1} - S\|_{\max}, \|V_{22}^{-1} - S_{22}\|_{\max}\} \leq \frac{c_0 b_n^3}{c_n^2 (n-1)^2}, \quad (10)$$

where  $c_0$  is a fixed constant.

The proof of Lemma 1 is given in Supplementary Material. It is noteworthy that the upper bounds in (10) are independent of  $r$ . This property implies some remainder terms in the proofs of Theorem 1 are in regardless of  $r$ . Besides, by Lemma 1 in Yan et al. (2023), we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *Under the  $p_0$ -model, if  $b_n^4/c_n^4 = o(n)$ , then  $\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i^2/v_{i,i}$  is asymptotically normally distributed with mean  $r$  and variance  $2r$ , where  $\bar{d}_i = d_i - \mathbb{E}d_i$ .*

We define a function  $\mu(x) = e^x/(1 + e^x)$  and a notation  $\pi_{ij} = \alpha_i + \beta_j$  for easy of exposition. A direct calculation gives that the derivative of  $\mu(x)$  up to the third order are

$$\mu'(x) = \frac{e^x}{(1 + e^x)^2}, \quad \mu''(x) = \frac{e^x(1 - e^x)}{(1 + e^x)^3}, \quad \mu'''(x) = \frac{e^x[(1 - e^x)^2 - 2e^x]}{(1 + e^x)^4}. \quad (11)$$

According to the definition of  $c_n$  in (5), we have the following inequalities:

$$|\mu'(\pi_{ij})| \leq \frac{1}{c_n}, \quad |\mu''(\pi_{ij})| \leq \frac{1}{c_n}, \quad |\mu'''(\pi_{ij})| \leq \frac{1}{c_n}. \quad (12)$$

The above inequalities will be used in the proofs repeatedly. Recall that  $\bar{a}_{i,j} = a_{i,j} - \mathbb{E}(a_{i,j})$  denotes the centered random variable of  $a_{i,j}$  and define  $\bar{a}_{i,i} = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Correspondingly, denote  $\bar{d}_i = d_i - \mathbb{E}(d_i) = \sum_j \bar{a}_{i,j}$ ,  $\bar{b}_j = b_j - \mathbb{E}(b_j) = \sum_i \bar{a}_{i,j}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{g}} = (\bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_n, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{n-1})^\top$ .

## 5.1 Proofs for Theorem 1 (a)

To prove Theorem 1 (a), we need three lemmas below.

**Lemma 3.** *Recall that  $V_{22}$  is the bottom right  $(2n - 1 - r) \times (2n - 1 - r)$  block of  $V$ . Let  $W = V^{-1} - S$ ,  $\widetilde{W}_{22} = V_{22}^{-1} - S_{22}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 = (\bar{d}_{r+1}, \dots, \bar{d}_n, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{n-1})^\top$ . For any given  $r \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ , we have*

$$\bar{\mathbf{g}}_2^\top \widetilde{W}_{22} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 = O_p \left( \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^3} \left(2 - \frac{r}{n}\right)^{3/2} \right),$$

where  $r = 0$  implies  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 = \bar{\mathbf{g}}$ ,  $V_{22} = V$  and  $\widetilde{W}_{22} = W$ .

Lemma 3 states that the remainder terms  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_2^\top \widetilde{W}_{22} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}^\top W \bar{\mathbf{g}}$  in (32) is in the order of  $O_p \left( (b_n^3/c_n^3) (2 - r/n)^{3/2} \right)$  for any given  $r \geq 0$ .

**Lemma 4.** Under the null  $H_0 : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r) = (\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_r^0)$  for any given  $r \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ , if

$$\frac{2b_n^6(2n-1-r)^2}{(n-1)^2c_n^5} = o\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}}\right), \quad (13)$$

then with probability at least  $1 - 4/n$ , the restricted MLE  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  exists and satisfies

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty \leq \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}},$$

where  $r = 0$  means there is no any restriction on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and implies  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0 = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ . Further, if the restricted MLE exists, it must be unique.

From Lemma 4, we can see that the consistency rate for the restricted MLE  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  in terms of the  $L_\infty$ -norm is independent of  $r$  while the condition depends on  $r$ . The larger  $r$  is, the weaker the condition is. When  $r = 0$ , the lemma gives the error bound for the MLE  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ .

**Lemma 5.** If (13) holds, then for an arbitrarily given  $r \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ ,

$$\sum_{i=r+1}^n (\widehat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i)^3 \sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij}) = O_p\left(\frac{(1-r/n)b_n^{11}(\log n)^2}{c_n^8}\right) + \frac{n(n-r)\bar{b}_n^3}{c_n v_{2n,2n}^3}, \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^3 \sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij}) = O_p\left(\frac{(1-r/n)b_n^{11}(\log n)^2}{c_n^8}\right) - \frac{n(n-r)\bar{b}_n^3}{c_n v_{2n,2n}^3}, \quad (15)$$

$$\sum_{i=r+1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{n-1} (\widehat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i)^2 (\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j) \mu''(\pi_{ij}) = O_p\left(\frac{(1-r/n)b_n^{11}(\log n)^2}{c_n^8}\right) - \frac{n(n-r)\bar{b}_n^3}{c_n v_{2n,2n}^3}, \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{i=r+1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{n-1} (\widehat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i) (\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \mu''(\pi_{ij}) = O_p\left(\frac{(1-r/n)b_n^{11}(\log n)^2}{c_n^8}\right) + \frac{n(n-r)\bar{b}_n^3}{c_n v_{2n,2n}^3}. \quad (17)$$

If  $\widehat{\alpha}_i$  is replaced with  $\widehat{\alpha}_i^0$  for  $i = r+1, \dots, n$ , then the above upper bound still holds.

*Proof of Theorem 1 (a).* Under the null  $H_0 : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r) = (\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_r^0)$ , the data generating parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is equal to  $(\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_r^0, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$ . For convenience, we suppress the superscript 0 in  $\alpha_i^0, i = 1, \dots, r$  when causing no confusion. The following calculations are based on the event  $E_n$  that  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  simultaneously exist and satisfy

$$\max\left\{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty, \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty\right\} \leq \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}. \quad (18)$$

By Lemma 4,  $\mathbb{P}(E_n) \geq 1 - O(n^{-1})$  if  $b_n^6/c_n^5 = o\{(n/\log n)^{1/2}\}$ .

Applying a fourth-order Taylor expansion to  $\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  at point  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \underbrace{\frac{\partial \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})}_{B_1} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^{2n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{2n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{2n-1} \frac{\partial^3 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} (\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i) (\widehat{\theta}_j - \theta_j) (\widehat{\theta}_k - \theta_k)}_{B_2} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{4!} \sum_{t=1}^{2n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{2n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{2n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{2n-1} \frac{\partial^4 \ell(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{\partial \theta_t \partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j \partial \theta_k} (\widehat{\theta}_t - \theta_t) (\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i) (\widehat{\theta}_j - \theta_j) (\widehat{\theta}_k - \theta_k)}_{B_3}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = t\boldsymbol{\theta} + (1-t)\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  for some  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Correspondingly,  $\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)$  has the following expansion:

$$\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0) - \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = B_1^0 + \frac{1}{6} B_2^0 + \frac{1}{4!} B_3^0,$$

where  $B_i^0$  is the version of  $B_i$  with  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  replaced by  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$ . Therefore,

$$2\{\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - \ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)\} = 2(B_1 - B_1^0) + \frac{1}{3}(B_2 - B_2^0) + \frac{1}{12}(B_3 - B_3^0). \quad (19)$$

Recall that

$$\frac{\partial \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} = \mathbf{g} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{g}, \quad V = -\frac{\partial^2 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top}.$$

Therefore,  $B_1$  can be written as

$$B_1 = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \bar{\mathbf{g}} - \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^\top V (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (20)$$

Let  $\ell'_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\ell'_{i,r+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \dots, \ell'_{i,2n-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) := (\frac{\partial \ell_i}{\partial \alpha_{r+1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial \ell_i}{\partial \alpha_n}, \frac{\partial \ell_i}{\partial \beta_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial \ell_i}{\partial \beta_{n-1}})$ . For the third-order expansion terms in  $B_2$ , for  $i = r+1, \dots, n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^3 \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \alpha_i^3} &= -\sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij}); & \frac{\partial^3 \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_j \partial \alpha_k} &= 0, i \neq j \neq k, \\ \frac{\partial^3 \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \alpha_i^2 \partial \beta_j} &= -\mu''(\pi_{ij}), j \neq i; & \frac{\partial^3 \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \alpha_i^2 \partial \beta_i} &= 0, \\ \frac{\partial^3 \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \beta_j^2} &= -\mu''(\pi_{ij}), i \neq j; & \frac{\partial^3 \ell_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \beta_j \partial \beta_k} &= 0, i \neq j \neq k, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$



and if there are at least three different values among the four indices  $i, j, k, t$ , we have

$$\frac{\partial^4 \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_j \partial \alpha_k \partial \alpha_t} = 0. \quad (22)$$

For  $i = n + 1, \dots, 2n - 1$ , we also have the similar result. Therefore,  $B_2$  and  $B_3$  have the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} -B_2 &= \sum_i (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i)^3 \sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij}) + 3 \sum_i \sum_{j, j \neq i} (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i)^2 (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j) \mu''(\pi_{ij}) \\ &+ \sum_j (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^3 \sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij}) + 3 \sum_i \sum_{j, j \neq i} (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i) (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \mu''(\pi_{ij}), \quad (23) \\ -B_3 &= \sum_i (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i)^4 \sum_{j \neq i} \mu'''(\bar{\pi}_{ij}) + \sum_j (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^4 \sum_{j \neq i} \mu'''(\bar{\pi}_{ij}) \\ &+ 4 \sum_i \sum_{j, j \neq i} (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i) (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^3 \mu'''(\bar{\pi}_{ij}) + 6 \sum_i \sum_{j, j \neq i} (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i)^2 (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \mu'''(\bar{\pi}_{ij}) \\ &+ 4 \sum_i \sum_{j, j \neq i} (\hat{\alpha}_i - \alpha_i)^3 (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j) \mu'''(\bar{\pi}_{ij}), \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\pi}_{ij}$  lies between  $\hat{\pi}_{ij}$  and  $\pi_{ij}$ .

It is sufficient to demonstrate: (1)  $\{2(B_1 - B_1^0) - r\}/(2r)^{1/2}$  converges in distribution to the standard normal distribution as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ; (2)  $(B_2 - B_2^0)/r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ ; (3)  $(B_3 - B_3^0)/r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ . The second claim is a direct result of Lemma 5. Note that  $\hat{\alpha}_i^0 = \alpha_i^0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . So  $B_3^0$  has less terms than  $B_3$ . In view of (12) and (18), if  $b_n^{12}/c_n^9 = o(r^{1/2}/(\log n)^2)$ , then

$$\frac{|B_3|}{r^{1/2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{r^{1/2}} \cdot \frac{n^2}{c_n} \cdot \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty^4 \lesssim \frac{b_n^{12}(\log n)^2}{r^{1/2}c_n^9} = o(1), \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{|B_3^0|}{r^{1/2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{r^{1/2}} \cdot \frac{n(n-r)}{c_n} \cdot \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty^4 \lesssim \frac{b_n^{12}(\log n)^2}{r^{1/2}c_n^9} = o(1), \quad (26)$$

which shows the third claim. Therefore, the remainder of the proof is to verify claim (1). This contains three steps. Step 1 is about explicit expressions of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$ . Step 2 is about the explicit expression of  $B_1 - B_1^0$ . Step 3 is about showing that the main term involved with  $B_1 - B_1^0$  asymptotically follows a normal distribution and the remainder terms goes to zero.

Step 1. We characterize the asymptotic representations of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$ . Recall that  $\pi_{ij} = \alpha_i + \beta_j$ . To simplify notations, define  $\hat{\pi}_{ij} = \hat{\alpha}_i + \hat{\beta}_j$ . A second-order Taylor

expansion gives that

$$\mu(\widehat{\pi}_{ij}) = \mu(\pi_{ij}) + \mu'(\pi_{ij})(\widehat{\pi}_{ij} - \pi_{ij}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu''(\tilde{\pi}_{ij})(\widehat{\pi}_{ij} - \pi_{ij})^2,$$

where  $\tilde{\pi}_{ij}$  lies between  $\widehat{\pi}_{ij}$  and  $\pi_{ij}$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} h_{i,j} &= \frac{1}{2}\mu''(\tilde{\pi}_{ij})(\widehat{\pi}_{ij} - \pi_{ij})^2, h_i = \sum_{k=1; k \neq i}^n h_{i,k}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ h_{n+i} &= \sum_{k=1; k \neq i}^n h_{k,i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1, \mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_{2n-1})^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In view of (12), we have  $|h_{i,j}| \leq \frac{1}{2c_n} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty^2$ ,  $|h_i| \leq \sum_{j=1; j \neq i}^n |h_{i,j}| \leq \frac{n-1}{2c_n} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty^2$ . Writing the above equations into the matrix form, we have

$$\mathbf{g} - \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{g}) = V(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \mathbf{h}.$$

It yields that

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta} = V^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{g}} - V^{-1}\mathbf{h}. \quad (28)$$

By Lemma 1, we have

$$|(W\mathbf{h})_i| \leq \|W\|_{\max} \times \left[ (2n-1) \max_i |h_i| \right] \leq O\left(\frac{b_n^9 \log n}{c_n^7 n}\right).$$

Note that  $(S\mathbf{h})_i = \frac{h_i}{v_{i,i}} + (-1)^{1(i>n)} \frac{h_{2n}}{v_{2n,2n}}$ ,  $h_{2n} := \sum_{i=1}^n h_i - \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n-1} h_i$ , we have

$$|(S\mathbf{h})_i| \leq \frac{|h_i|}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{|h_{2n}|}{v_{2n,2n}} \leq O\left(\frac{b_n^7 \log n}{c_n^5 n}\right).$$

Therefore, we have

$$|(V^{-1}\mathbf{h})_i| \leq |(S\mathbf{h})_i| + |(W\mathbf{h})_i| \leq O\left(\frac{b_n^9 \log n}{c_n^7 n}\right). \quad (29)$$

Recall  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 = (\bar{d}_{r+1}, \dots, \bar{d}_n, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{n-1})^\top$ . Let  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2^0 = (\widehat{\alpha}_{r+1}^0, \dots, \widehat{\alpha}_n^0, \widehat{\beta}_1^0, \dots, \widehat{\beta}_{n-1}^0)^\top$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 =$

$(\alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$ . Similar to (28), we have

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_2^0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = V_{22}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 - V_{22}^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_2, \quad (30)$$

where  $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_2 = (\widetilde{h}_{r+1}, \dots, \widetilde{h}_{2n-1})^\top$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} = (\widetilde{h}_1, \dots, \widetilde{h}_{2n-1})^\top$  and

$$\widetilde{h}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2} \mu''(\widetilde{\pi}_{ij}^0) (\widetilde{\pi}_{ij}^0 - \pi_{ij})^2, \quad |\widetilde{h}_i| \leq \frac{b_n^6 \log n}{c_n^5}. \quad (31)$$

In the above equation,  $\widetilde{\pi}_{ij}^0$  lies between  $\pi_{ij}$  and  $\widehat{\pi}_{ij}^0 = \widehat{\alpha}_i + \widehat{\beta}_j$ .

Step 2. We derive the explicit expression of  $B_1 - B_1^0$ . Substituting (28) and (30) into the expressions of  $B_1$  in (20) and  $B_1^0$  respectively, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2B_1 &= \bar{\mathbf{g}}^\top V^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbf{h}^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{h}, \\ 2B_1^0 &= \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2^\top V_{22}^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 - \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top V_{22}^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_2. \end{aligned}$$

By setting  $V^{-1} = S + W$  and  $V_{22}^{-1} = S_{22} + \widetilde{W}_{22}$ , we have

$$2(B_1 - B_1^0) = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\bar{d}_i^2}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{\bar{b}_n^2}{v_{2n,2n}} - \frac{(\bar{b}_n - \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i)^2}{\widetilde{v}_{2n,2n}} + \bar{\mathbf{g}}^\top W \bar{\mathbf{g}} - \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2^\top \widetilde{W}_{22} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 - \mathbf{h}^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{h} + \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top V_{22}^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_2. \quad (32)$$

Step 3. We show four claims: (i)  $(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i^2 / v_{i,i} - r) / (2r)^{1/2} \xrightarrow{L} N(0, 1)$ ; (ii)  $\frac{\bar{b}_n^2}{r^{1/2} v_{2n,2n}} = o_p(1)$  and  $\frac{(\bar{b}_n - \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i)^2}{r^{1/2} \widetilde{v}_{2n,2n}} = o_p(1)$ ; (iii)  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}^\top W \bar{\mathbf{g}} / r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_2^\top \widetilde{W}_{22} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 / r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ ; (iv)  $\mathbf{h}^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{h} / r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top V_{22}^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{h}}_2 / r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ . The first and three claims directly follows from Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, respectively. If  $b_n = o(r^{1/2} / \log n)$ , we have

$$\left| \frac{\bar{b}_n^2}{r^{1/2} v_{2n,2n}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{r^{1/2}} \cdot n \log n \cdot \frac{b_n}{n-1} = o(1),$$

Let  $v_{0,0} = \sum_{i=1}^r v_{i,i}$ . Since  $\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \bar{a}_{i,j}$ , by the central limit theorem for bounded case [Loève (1977) (p.289)],  $v_{0,0}^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i$  converges in distribution to the standard normal distribution if  $v_{0,0} \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i)^2}{v_{0,0}} \cdot \frac{v_{0,0}}{\widetilde{v}_{2n,2n}} \cdot \frac{1}{r^{1/2}} = o_p(1)$$

This demonstrates claim (ii). By (29), we have

$$\|\mathbf{h}^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{h}\| \leq (2n-1) \|\mathbf{h}\|_\infty \|V^{-1} \mathbf{h}\|_\infty \lesssim (2n-1) \cdot \frac{b_n^6 \log n}{c_n^5} \cdot \frac{b_n^9 \log n}{nc_n^7} \lesssim \frac{b_n^{15} (\log n)^2}{c_n^{12}}.$$

If  $b_n^{15}/c_n^{12} = o(r^{1/2}/(\log n)^2)$ , then

$$\frac{1}{r^{1/2}}|\mathbf{h}^\top V^{-1}\mathbf{h}| \lesssim \frac{b_n^{15}(\log n)^2}{r^{1/2}c_n^{12}} = o(1). \quad (33)$$

In view of (31), with the same arguments as in the proof of the above inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{r^{1/2}}|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top V_{22}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2| \lesssim \frac{(2n-1-r)b_n^{15}(\log n)^2}{nr^{1/2}c_n^{12}} = o(1). \quad (34)$$

This demonstrates claim (iv). It completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5.2 Proofs for Theorem 1 (b)

Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = (\sum_{i=1}^r d_i, d_{r+1}, \dots, d_n, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1})^\top$  and  $\tilde{V}$  denote the Fisher information matrix of  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$  under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$  with  $r \leq n$ , where

$$\tilde{V} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{v}_{11} & \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{12}^\top \\ \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{12} & V_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

where  $V_{22}$  is the lower right  $(2n-1-r) \times (2n-1-r)$  block of  $V$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{12} = (\tilde{v}_{1,r+1}, \dots, \tilde{v}_{1,2n-1})^\top$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}_{11} &= \sum_{j \neq 1} \frac{e^{\alpha_1 + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\alpha_1 + \beta_j})^2} + \dots + \sum_{j \neq r} \frac{e^{\alpha_1 + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\alpha_1 + \beta_j})^2}, \\ \tilde{v}_{1,i} &= 0, \quad i = r+1, \dots, n, \\ \tilde{v}_{1,i} &= \frac{(r-1)e^{\alpha_1 + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\alpha_1 + \beta_j})^2}, \quad i = n+1, \dots, n+r, \quad j = i-n, \\ \tilde{v}_{1,i} &= \frac{re^{\alpha_1 + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\alpha_1 + \beta_j})^2}, \quad i = n+r+1, \dots, 2n-1, \quad j = i-n. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\tilde{V}$  is also the covariance matrix of  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ . Similar to approximate  $V^{-1}$  by  $S$ , we use  $\tilde{S}$  to approximate  $\tilde{V}^{-1}$ , where  $\tilde{S}(= (s_{i,j})_{(2n-r) \times (2n-r)})$

$$s_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\tilde{v}_{11}} + \frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}}, & i, j = 1, \\ \frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}}, & i = 1, j = r+1, \dots, n; i = r+1, \dots, n, j = 1, \\ -\frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}}, & i = 1, \dots, n, j = n+1, \dots, 2n-1; i = n+1, \dots, 2n-1, j = 1, \dots, n, \\ \frac{\delta_{i,j}}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}}, & i, j = r+1, \dots, n; i, j = n+1, \dots, 2n-1. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

The approximation error is stated in the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.** *For any  $r \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$  and  $n \geq 2$ , we have*

$$\|\tilde{W} := \tilde{V}^{-1} - \tilde{S}\|_{\max} \leq \frac{b_n^3}{n^2 c_n^2}. \quad (37)$$

As we can see, the order of the above approximation error is the same as that in (10) and is independent of  $r$ .

Similar to Lemma 3, we have the following bound, which is independent of  $r$ .

**Lemma 7.** *For any given  $r \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , we have*

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})^\top \tilde{W} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}) = O_p\left(\frac{b_n^3}{c_n^3}\right).$$

Recall that  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  denotes the restricted MLE of  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$ . Under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ , we have  $\hat{\alpha}_1^0 = \dots = \hat{\alpha}_r^0$ . Similar to the proof of Lemma 4, we have the following consistency result.

**Lemma 8.** *Under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ , if*

$$\left(\frac{(n-r+2)b_n}{c_n} + \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^3}\right) \left\{b_n + \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^2} \left(\frac{r^{1/2}}{n} + \frac{2n-r-1}{n}\right)\right\} = o\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\log n}}\right),$$

then with probability at least  $1 - 2(2n-r)/n^2$ ,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  exists and satisfies

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty \lesssim \left(b_n + \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^2} \left(\frac{r^{1/2}}{n} + \frac{2n-r-1}{n}\right)\right) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}.$$

Further, if  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  exists, it must be unique.

From the above lemma, we can see that the condition to guarantee consistency and the error bound depends on  $r$ . A rough condition in regardless of  $r$  to guarantee consistency is  $b_n^6/c_n^5 = o((n/\log n)^{1/2})$  that will be used in the proof of Theorem 1 (b). It implies an error bound  $(b_n^3/c_n^2)(\log n/n)^{1/2}$ .

The asymptotic representation of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  is given below.

**Lemma 9.** *Under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ , if  $b_n^6/c_n^5 = o((n/\log n)^{1/2})$ , then for any given  $r \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ , we have*

$$\widehat{\alpha}_1^0 - \alpha_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i}{\bar{v}_{11}} + \frac{\bar{b}_n}{v_{2n,2n}} + \gamma_1^0, \quad (38)$$

$$\widehat{\alpha}_i^0 - \alpha_i = \frac{\bar{d}_i}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{\bar{b}_n}{v_{2n,2n}} + \gamma_i^0, \quad i = r+1, \dots, n, \quad (39)$$

$$\widehat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j = \frac{\bar{b}_j}{v_{n+j,n+j}} - \frac{\bar{b}_n}{v_{2n,2n}} + \gamma_{n+j}^0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (40)$$

where  $\gamma_1^0, \gamma_{r+1}^0, \dots, \gamma_{2n-1}^0$  with probability at least  $1 - O(n^{-1})$  satisfy

$$\gamma_i^0 = (\widetilde{V}^{-1}\widetilde{\mathbf{h}})_i + [\widetilde{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\widetilde{\mathbf{g}})]_i = O\left(\frac{b_n^9 \log n}{nc_n^7}\right),$$

uniformly, and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} = (\widetilde{h}_1, \widetilde{h}_{r+1}, \dots, \widetilde{h}_{2n-1})^\top$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\widetilde{h}_1| &\lesssim \frac{rb_n^6 \log n}{c_n^5}, \\ \max_{i=r+1, \dots, 2n-1} |\widetilde{h}_i| &\lesssim \frac{b_n^6 \log n}{c_n^5}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

With some ambiguity of notations, we still use the notation  $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}$  here that is a little different from  $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}$  defined in (31) in Section 5.1. Specifically, the first element of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}$  can be viewed as the sum of  $\widetilde{h}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$  in (31).

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 1 (b).

*Proof of Theorem 1 (b).* Under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ , the data generating parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is equal to  $(\underbrace{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_1}_r, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$ . The following calculations are

based on the event  $E_n$  that  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  simultaneously exist and satisfy

$$\max \left\{ \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty, \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\infty \right\} \lesssim \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \quad (42)$$

By Lemma 8,  $\mathbb{P}(E_n) \geq 1 - O(n^{-1})$  if  $b_n^6/c_n^5 = o((n/\log n)^{1/2})$ .

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1 (a), it is sufficient to demonstrate: (1)  $\{2(B_1 - B_1^0) - r\}/(2r)^{1/2}$  converges in distribution to the standard normal distribution; (2)  $(B_2 - B_2^0)/r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ ; (3)  $(B_3 - B_3^0)/r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ . The fourth-order Taylor expansion for  $\ell(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0)$  here is with regard to the vector  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$  because  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$  are the same under the null here. As we shall see, the expressions of  $B_1^0$  and  $B_2^0$  are a little different from  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  except from the difference  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$ .

With the same arguments as in (25) and (26), we have the third claim under the condition  $b_n^{12}/c_n^9 = o(r^{1/2}/(\log n))$ . In Lemma 5, we show  $B_2/r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ . For second claim, it is sufficient to show  $B_2^0/r^{1/2} = o_p(1)$ . Under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ ,  $B_2^0$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
-B_2^0 &= \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij})(\hat{\alpha}_1^0 - \alpha_1)^3 + \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{i=r+1, i \neq j}^n (\mu''(\pi_{ij}) + (r-1)\mu''(\pi_{1j}))(\hat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j)^3 \\
&+ \sum_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \sum_{i=r+1, i \neq j}^n (\mu''(\pi_{ij}) + r\mu''(\pi_{1j}))(\hat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j)^3 + \sum_{i=r+1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij})(\hat{\alpha}_i^0 - \alpha_i)^3 \\
&+ 3(r-1) \sum_{j=1}^r \mu''(\pi_{1j})(\hat{\alpha}_1^0 - \alpha_1)^2(\hat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j) + 3r \sum_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \mu''(\pi_{1j})(\hat{\alpha}_1^0 - \alpha_1)^2(\hat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j) \\
&+ 3(r-1) \sum_{j=1}^r \mu''(\pi_{1j})(\hat{\alpha}_1^0 - \alpha_1)(\hat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j)^2 + 3r \sum_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \mu''(\pi_{1j})(\hat{\alpha}_1^0 - \alpha_1)(\hat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j)^2 \\
&+ 3 \sum_{i=r+1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij})(\hat{\alpha}_i^0 - \alpha_i)^2(\hat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j) + 3 \sum_{i=r+1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} \mu''(\pi_{ij})(\hat{\alpha}_i^0 - \alpha_i)(\hat{\beta}_j^0 - \beta_j)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

With the use of the asymptotic representation of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  in Lemma 9, if

$$b_n^{11}/c_n^8 = o\left(\frac{n}{(\log n)^2 r}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad b_n^{11}/c_n^8 = o\left(\frac{n}{(\log n)^2 (n-r)}\right),$$

then we have

$$\frac{B_2^0}{r^{1/2}} = o_p(1), \tag{43}$$

whose detailed calculations are given in the supplementary material.

Next, we show first claim. Recall  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = (\sum_{i=1}^r d_i, d_{r+1}, \dots, d_n, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1})^\top$ . The expression of  $B_1^0$  is

$$B_1^0 = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})^\top \tilde{V}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}) - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \tilde{V}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \tag{44}$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = (\tilde{h}_1, \tilde{h}_{r+1}, \dots, \tilde{h}_{2n-1})^\top$  satisfies (41). In view of (37) and (41), setting  $\tilde{V}^{-1} =$

$\tilde{S} + \tilde{W}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \tilde{V}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}} &\leq \underbrace{\frac{\tilde{h}_1^2}{\tilde{v}_{11}} + \sum_{i=r+1}^{2n-1} \frac{h_i^2}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{\tilde{h}_{2n}^2}{v_{2n,2n}}}_{\text{Term 1}} + \underbrace{|\tilde{w}_{11}| \tilde{h}_1^2 + \|\tilde{W}\|_{\max} \left( 2|\tilde{h}_1| \sum_{i=r+1}^{2n-1} |\tilde{h}_i| + \sum_{i,j=r+1}^{2n-1} |\tilde{h}_i| |\tilde{h}_j| \right)}_{\text{Term 2}} \\
&\lesssim b_n \left( \frac{b_n^6 \log n}{c_n^5} \right)^2 + \frac{b_n^3}{n^2 c_n^2} \{r^2 + 2r(2n - r - 1) + (2n - r - 1)^2\} \left( \frac{b_n^6 \log n}{c_n^5} \right)^2 \\
&\lesssim \frac{b_n^{15} (\log n)^2}{c_n^{12}}. \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that if  $b_n^{15}/c_n^{12} = o(r^{1/2}/(\log n)^2)$ ,

$$\frac{|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \tilde{V}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}|}{\sqrt{r}} = o_p(1).$$

Now, we evaluate the difference between  $(\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})^\top \tilde{V}^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}^\top V^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ . By using  $\tilde{S}$  and  $S$  to approximate  $\tilde{V}^{-1}$  and  $V^{-1}$  respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\mathbf{g}}^\top V^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{g}} - (\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})^\top \tilde{V}^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\bar{d}_i^2}{v_{i,i}} - \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i)^2}{\tilde{v}_{11}} + \tilde{\mathbf{g}}^\top W \tilde{\mathbf{g}} - (\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})^\top \tilde{W} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}}). \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas 3 and 7, if  $b_n^3/c_n^3 = o(r^{1/2})$ , then

$$\frac{1}{r^{1/2}} \max\{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}^\top W \tilde{\mathbf{g}}, (\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})^\top \tilde{W} (\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{g}})\} = o_p(1). \tag{47}$$

Since  $\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{a}_{i,j}$ , by the central limit theorem for bounded case [Loève (1977) (p.289)],  $\tilde{v}_{11}^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i$  converges in distribution to the standard normal distribution if  $\tilde{v}_{11} \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{[\sum_{i=1}^r \{d_i - \mathbb{E}(d_i)\}]^2 / \tilde{v}_{11}}{r} = o_p(1).$$

By combining (44), (45), (46) and (47), it yields

$$\frac{2(B_1 - B_1^0)}{\sqrt{2r}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2r}} \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{(d_i - \mathbb{E}d_i)^2}{v_{i,i}} + o_p(1).$$

Therefore, the first claim immediately follows from Lemma 2. This completes the proof.  $\square$



### 5.3 Proofs for Theorem 2

Recall that  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 = (\bar{d}_{r+1}, \dots, \bar{d}_n, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{n-1})^\top$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = (\sum_{i=1}^r d_i, d_{r+1}, \dots, d_n, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1})^\top$  and  $\tilde{V}$  is given in (35).  $\tilde{V}$  is the Fisher information matrix of  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_{r+1}, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})^\top$  under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$ . Let  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_1 = (\bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_r)^\top$ . Remark that  $r$  is a fixed constant in this section. Partition  $V$ ,  $W$  and  $\tilde{W}$  into four blocks

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} \\ V_{21} & V_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad W = \begin{pmatrix} W_{11} & W_{12} \\ W_{21} & W_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{W} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{w}_{11} & \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{12} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{21} & \tilde{W}_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

where  $V_{11}$  and  $W_{11}$  are respective  $r \times r$  dimensional sub-matrices of  $V$  and  $W$ , and  $W = V^{-1} - S$ .  $\tilde{w}_{11}$  is a scalar and the dimension of  $\tilde{W}_{22}$  is  $(2n - r - 1) \times (2n - r - 1)$ . It should be noted  $\tilde{W}_{22}$  is different from  $\widetilde{W}_{22}$  in the proof of Theorem 1 (a), where  $\widetilde{W}_{22} = V_{22}^{-1} - S_{22}$ . With some ambiguity of notation, we use the same notation here. However, both share very similar properties.

To prove Theorem 2, we need the following four lemmas. The following lemma gives the upper bounds of five remainder terms in (52) that tend to zero. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 14 in Yan et al. (2023) and is omitted.

**Lemma 10.** *Suppose  $r$  is a fixed constant.*

(a) If  $b_n^3/c_n^2 = o(n^{3/2}/(\log n)^{1/2})$ , then  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_1^\top W_{11} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_1 = o_p(1)$ .

(b) If  $b_n^3/c_n^3 = o(n^{1/2})$ , then  $\bar{\mathbf{g}}_1^\top W_{12} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 = o_p(1)$ .

(c) If  $b_n^3/c_n^2 = o(n^{3/2}/(\log n)^{1/2})$ , then  $(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i) \tilde{w}_{11} (\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i) = o_p(1)$ .

(d) If  $b_n^3/c_n^3 = o(n^{1/2})$ , then  $(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i) \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{12}^\top \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 = o_p(1)$ .

(e) If  $b_n^3/c_n^3 = o(n^{3/4})$ , then

$$\bar{\mathbf{g}}_2^\top (W_{22} - \widetilde{W}_{22}) \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 = o_p(1).$$

The lemma below gives an upper bound of  $\|W_{22} - \widetilde{W}_{22}\|_{\max}$ .

**Lemma 11.** *For a fixed constant  $r$ , the entry-wise error between  $W_{22}$  and  $\widetilde{W}_{22}$  is*

$$(W_{22} - \widetilde{W}_{22})_{ij} = H_2 + \frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}} H_1 \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & -\mathbf{1} \\ -\mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix}}_{\substack{n-r \\ n-1}} \Bigg\}^{n-r} \quad (49)$$

where

$$\|H_1\|_{\max} = O\left(\frac{b_n^4}{n^2 c_n^3}\right), \quad \|H_2\|_{\max} = O\left(\frac{b_n^6}{n^3 c_n^5}\right). \quad (50)$$

The lemma below establishes the upper bound of  $\hat{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_i^0$ . This lemma is a direct conclusion of Theorem 2 in Yan et al. (2016) and Lemma 9.

**Lemma 12.** Under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$  with a fixed  $r$ , if  $b_n^6/c_n^5 = o((n/\log n)^{1/2})$ , then with probability at least  $1 - O(n^{-1})$ ,

$$\max_{i=r+1, \dots, 2n-1} |\hat{\theta}_i - \hat{\theta}_i^0| \lesssim \frac{b_n^9 \log n}{nc_n^7}.$$

The above error bound is in the magnitude of  $n^{-1}$ , up to a factor  $b_n^9 \log n$ , which makes the remainder terms in (52) be asymptotically neglected.

**Lemma 13.** If  $b_n^6/c_n^5 = o((n/\log n)^{1/2})$ , then  $\gamma_i - \gamma_i^0$ ,  $i = r + 1, \dots, 2n - 1$  are bounded by

$$\max_{i=r+1, \dots, 2n-1} |\gamma_i - \gamma_i^0| \lesssim \frac{b_n^{15} (\log n)^{3/2}}{n^{3/2} c_n^{12}}, \quad (51)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i &= (W\bar{\mathbf{g}})_i + (V^{-1}\mathbf{h})_i, \\ \gamma_i^0 &= (\tilde{V}^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{h}})_i + [\tilde{W}(\bar{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbb{E}\bar{\mathbf{g}})]_i \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Note that  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^0$  denotes the restricted MLE under the null space  $\Theta_0 = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-1} : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r\}$ . The following calculations are based on the event  $E_n$  that is defined in (18). By Lemmas 4 and 12,  $\mathbb{P}(E_n) \geq 1 - O(n^{-1})$  if  $b_n^6/c_n^5 = o((n/\log n)^{1/2})$ .

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1 (a), it is sufficient to demonstrate: (1)  $2(B_1 - B_1^0)$  converges in distribution to the chi-square distribution with  $r - 1$  degrees of freedom; (2)

$$B_2 - B_2^0 = O_p\left(\frac{b_n^{21} (\log n)^{5/2}}{n^{1/2} c_n^{17}}\right), \quad B_3 - B_3^0 = O_p\left(\frac{b_n^{18} (\log n)^{5/2}}{n^{1/2} c_n^{14}}\right).$$

These two claims are proved in the following three steps, respectively.

Step 1. We show  $2(B_1 - B_1^0) \xrightarrow{L} \chi_{r-1}^2$ . Using the matrix form in (48),  $B_1 - B_1^0$  in (32) and (46) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(B_1 - B_1^0) \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\bar{d}_i^2}{v_{i,i}} - \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i)^2}{\tilde{v}_{11}}}_{Z_1} + \bar{\mathbf{g}}_1^\top W_{11} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_1 + 2\bar{\mathbf{g}}_1^\top W_{12} \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i\right)^2 \tilde{w}_{11} \\ & \quad + 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i\right) \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{12}^\top \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 + \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2^\top (W_{22} - \tilde{W}_{22}) \bar{\mathbf{g}}_2 - \underbrace{\mathbf{h}^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{h} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \tilde{V}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}}_{Z_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where  $\mathbf{h}$  is defined in (27) and  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$  is in (41). In view of Lemma 10, it is sufficient to demonstrate: (i)  $Z_1$  converges in distribution to a chi-square distribution with  $r-1$  degrees of freedom; (ii)  $Z_2 = o_p(1)$ . Because  $\bar{d}_i = \sum_{j=r+1}^n a_{i,j}$  is independent over  $i = 1, \dots, r$  and  $r$  is a fixed constant, the classical central limit theorem for the bounded case [Loève (1977), p. 289] gives that the vector  $(\bar{d}_1/v_{11}^{1/2}, \dots, \bar{d}_r/v_{rr}^{1/2})$  follows a  $r$ -dimensional standard normal distribution. Because  $v_{11} = \dots = v_{rr}$  under the null  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_r$  and  $\tilde{v}_{11} = rv_{11}$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\bar{d}_i^2}{v_{ii}} - \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^r \bar{d}_i)^2}{\tilde{v}_{11}} = \left( \frac{\bar{d}_1}{v_{11}^{1/2}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{d}_r}{v_{11}^{1/2}} \right) \left( I_r - \frac{1}{r} \mathbf{1}_r \mathbf{1}_r^\top \right) \left( \frac{\bar{d}_1}{v_{11}^{1/2}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{d}_r}{v_{11}^{1/2}} \right)^\top.$$

Because  $\text{rank}(I_r - \mathbf{1}_r \mathbf{1}_r^\top / r) = r - 1$ , it follows that we have claim (i). Now, we show  $Z_2 = o_p(1)$ . By setting  $V^{-1} = S + W$  and  $\tilde{V}^{-1} = \tilde{S} + \tilde{W}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{h} &= \sum_{i=1}^{2n-1} \frac{h_i^2}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{h_{2n}^2}{v_{2n,2n}} + \mathbf{h}_1^\top W_{11} \mathbf{h}_1 + 2\mathbf{h}_1^\top W_{12} \mathbf{h}_2 + \mathbf{h}_2^\top W_{22} \mathbf{h}_2, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \tilde{V}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}} &= \frac{\tilde{h}_1^2}{\tilde{v}_{11}} + \sum_{i=r+1}^{2n-1} \frac{\tilde{h}_i^2}{v_{i,i}} + \frac{\tilde{h}_{2n}^2}{v_{2n,2n}} + \tilde{w}_{11} \tilde{h}_1^2 + 2\tilde{h}_1 \tilde{w}_{12} \tilde{h}_2 + \tilde{h}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \tilde{h}_2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{h}_1 = (h_1, \dots, h_r)^\top$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_2 = (h_{r+1}, \dots, h_{2n-1})^\top$ , and  $h_i$  and  $\tilde{h}_i$  are given in (27) and (41), respectively. Since  $\|\mathbf{h}\|_\infty \lesssim b_n^6 \log n / c_n^5$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2n-1} \frac{h_i^2}{v_{i,i}} - \sum_{i=r+1}^{2n-1} \frac{\tilde{h}_i^2}{v_{i,i}} = \sum_{i=r+1}^{2n-1} \frac{h_i^2 - \tilde{h}_i^2}{v_{i,i}} + O\left(\frac{b_n^{13} (\log n)^2}{nc_n^{11}}\right).$$

The difference  $h_i - \tilde{h}_i$  is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i=r+1, \dots, 2n-1} |h_i - \tilde{h}_i| &\leq \sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ |\mu''(\tilde{\pi}_{ij})(\hat{\pi}_{ij} - \pi_{ij})^2 - \mu''(\tilde{\pi}_{ij}^0)(\hat{\pi}_{ij} - \pi_{ij})^2| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\mu''(\tilde{\pi}_{ij}^0)(\hat{\pi}_{ij} - \pi_{ij})^2 - \mu''(\tilde{\pi}_{ij}^0)(\hat{\pi}_{ij}^0 - \pi_{ij})^2| \right\} \\ &\lesssim \frac{n}{c_n} \left\{ |\tilde{\pi}_{ij} - \tilde{\pi}_{ij}^0| \cdot (\hat{\pi}_{ij} - \pi_{ij})^2 + |\hat{\pi}_{ij} - \hat{\pi}_{ij}^0| \cdot (|\hat{\pi}_{ij} - \pi_{ij}| + |\hat{\pi}_{ij}^0 - \pi_{ij}|) \right\} \\ &\lesssim \frac{n}{c_n} \cdot \left( \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right)^3 + \frac{n}{c_n} \cdot \frac{b_n^9 \log n}{nc_n^7} \cdot \frac{b_n^3}{c_n^2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{b_n^{27} (\log n)^2}{n^{1/2} c_n^9}, \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where the second inequality is due to (12) and the mean value theorem and the third

inequality follows from (18). Therefore, if  $b_n^{13}/c_n^{11} = o(n/(\log n)^2)$ , then

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{2n-1} \frac{h_i^2}{v_{i,i}} - \sum_{i=r+1}^{2n-1} \frac{\tilde{h}_i^2}{v_{i,i}} \right| = O\left(\frac{b_n^{13}(\log n)^2}{nc_n^{11}}\right) + O\left(\frac{b_n^{28}(\log n)^2}{n^{3/2}c_n^9}\right) = o(1). \quad (54)$$

By (10), (37) and (41), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{h}_1^\top W_{11} \mathbf{h}_1| &\leq r^2 \|W_{11}\|_{\max} \|\mathbf{h}_1\|_\infty^2 \lesssim r^2 \cdot (b_n^6 \log n)^2 \cdot \frac{b_n^3}{n^2 c_n^2} \lesssim \frac{b_n^{15} (\log n)^2}{n^2 c_n^2}, \\ |\mathbf{h}_1^\top W_{12} \mathbf{h}_2| &\lesssim r(2n-r) \cdot (b_n^6 \log n)^2 \cdot \frac{b_n^3}{n^2 c_n^2} \lesssim \frac{b_n^{15} (\log n)^2}{nc_n^2}, \\ \frac{\tilde{h}_1^2}{\tilde{v}_{11}} &\lesssim \frac{r^2 (b_n^6 \log n / c_n^5)^2}{rn/b_n} \lesssim \frac{b_n^{13} (\log n)^2}{nc_n^{10}}, \\ |\tilde{w}_{11} \tilde{h}_1^2| &\lesssim (b_n^6 \log n / c_n^5)^2 \cdot \frac{b_n^3}{n^2 c_n^2} \lesssim \frac{b_n^{15} (\log n)^2}{n^2 c_n^{12}}, \\ |\tilde{h}_1 \tilde{w}_{12} \tilde{h}_2| &\lesssim 2n-r \cdot (b_n^6 \log n / c_n^5)^2 \cdot \frac{b_n^3}{n^2 c_n^2} \lesssim \frac{b_n^{15} (\log n)^2}{nc_n^{12}}. \end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the bound of  $\mathbf{h}_2^\top W_{22} \mathbf{h}_2 - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2$ , we divide it into three terms:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{h}_2^\top W_{22} \mathbf{h}_2 - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2 \\ = &\underbrace{\mathbf{h}_2^\top W_{22} \mathbf{h}_2 - \mathbf{h}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \mathbf{h}_2}_{C_1} + \underbrace{\mathbf{h}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \mathbf{h}_2 - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \mathbf{h}_2}_{C_2} + \underbrace{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \mathbf{h}_2 - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2}_{C_3}. \quad (55) \end{aligned}$$

The first term  $C_1$  is bounded as follows. By (49), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{h}_2^\top (W_{22} - \tilde{W}_{22}) \mathbf{h}_2| &\leq (2n-r)^2 \|\mathbf{h}_2\|_\infty^2 \frac{b_n^6}{n^3 c_n^5} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{v_{2n,2n}} |H_1(-1)^{1(i>n-r)}| \left( \sum_{i=r+1}^n h_i - \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n-1} h_i \right) \mathbf{1}_{2n-r-1} \mathbf{h}_2| \\ &\lesssim \frac{b_n^{18} (\log n)^2}{nc_n^{15}} + (2n-r) \cdot \frac{b_n}{n} \cdot \frac{b_n^3}{n^2 c_n^3} \cdot \left( \frac{b_n^6 \log n}{c_n^5} \right)^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{b_n^{18} (\log n)^2}{nc_n^{15}}. \quad (56) \end{aligned}$$

In view of (37) and (53), the upper bounds of  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  are derived as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |C_2| &= |(\mathbf{h}_2 - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2)^\top \tilde{W}_{22} \mathbf{h}_2| \leq (2n-r)^2 \|\tilde{W}_{22}\|_{\max} \|\mathbf{h}_2 - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2\|_\infty \|\mathbf{h}_2\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim n^2 \cdot \frac{b_n^3}{n^2 c_n^2} \cdot \frac{b_n^{27} (\log n)^2}{n^{1/2} c_n^9} \cdot b_n^6 \log n \lesssim \frac{b_n^{36} (\log n)^3}{n^{1/2} c_n^{11}}. \quad (57) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |C_3| &= |\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2^\top \tilde{W}_{22}(\mathbf{h}_2 - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2)| \leq (2n - r)^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2\|_\infty \|\tilde{W}_{22}\|_{\max} \|\mathbf{h}_2 - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2\|_\infty \\ &\lesssim \frac{b_n^{36} (\log n)^3}{n^{1/2} c_n^{11}}. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

By combining (54)–(58), it yields

$$|\mathbf{h}^\top V^{-1} \mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^\top \tilde{V}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}| \lesssim \frac{b_n^{36} (\log n)^3}{n^{1/2} c_n^{11}}.$$

This completes the proof of the first step.

Step 2. To prove that this term does go to zero, we did a careful analysis on the difference  $B_2 - B_2^0$  by using asymptotic representations of  $\hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i$  and  $\hat{\theta}_i^0 - \theta_i$ . With the use of Lemmas 5 and 12, we have

$$B_2 - B_2^0 = O_p \left( \frac{b_n^{21} (\log n)^{5/2}}{n^{1/2} c_n^{17}} \right). \quad (59)$$

whose detailed proofs are given in Supplementary Material.

Step 3. With the use of asymptotic representations of  $\hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i$  and  $\hat{\theta}_i^0 - \theta_i$  and Lemma 12, we can show

$$B_3 - B_3^0 = O_p \left( \frac{b_n^{18} (\log n)^{5/2}}{n^{1/2} c_n^{14}} \right) \quad (60)$$

whose detailed proofs are given in Supplementary Material. □

## References

- Bradley, R. A. and Terry, M. E. (1952). Rank analysis of incomplete block designs the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika*, 39(3-4):324–345.
- Chatterjee, S., Diaconis, P., and Sly, A. (2011). Random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 21(4):1400–1435.
- Fan, J., Zhang, C., and Zhang, J. (2001). Generalized Likelihood Ratio Statistics and Wilks Phenomenon. *The Annals of Statistics*, 29(1):153 – 193.
- Fienberg, S. E. (2012). A brief history of statistical models for network analysis and open challenges. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 21(4):825–839.
- Fienberg, S. E. and Wasserman, S. (1981). An exponential family of probability distribu-

- tions for directed graphs: Comment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 76(373):54–57.
- Goldenberg, A., Zheng, A. X., Fienberg, S. E., and Airolidi, E. M. (2010). A survey of statistical network models. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 2(2):129–233.
- Holland, P. W. and Leinhardt, S. (1981). An exponential family of probability distributions for directed graphs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 76(373):33–50.
- Kunegis, J. (2013). Konect: the koblenz network collection. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on world wide web*, pages 1343–1350.
- Loève, M. (1977). *Probability theory I. 4th ed.* Springer, New York.
- Opsahl, T. and Panzarasa, P. (2009). Clustering in weighted networks. *Social networks*, 31(2):155–163.
- Wilks, S. S. (1938). The Large-Sample Distribution of the Likelihood Ratio for Testing Composite Hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 9(1):60 – 62.
- Yan, T. (2021). Directed networks with a differentially private bi-degree sequence. *Statistica Sinica*, 31:2031–2050.
- Yan, T., Leng, C., and Zhu, J. (2016). Asymptotics in directed exponential random graph models with an increasing bi-degree sequence. *The Annals of Statistics*, (44):31–57.
- Yan, T., Li, Y., Xu, J., Yang, Y., and Zhu, J. (2023). Likelihood ratio tests in random graph models with increasing dimensions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05806*.
- Yin, H., Benson, A. R., Leskovec, J., and Gleich, D. F. (2017). Local higher-order graph clustering. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 555–564.