

On a new robust method of inference for general time series models

Zihan Wang¹, Xinghao Qiao², Dong Li¹, and Howell Tong^{1,3}

¹*Department of Statistics and Data Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China*

²*Faculty of Business and Economics, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*

³*Department of Statistics, London School of Economics, London, U.K.*

Abstract

In this article, we propose a novel logistic quasi-maximum likelihood estimation (LQMLE) for general parametric time series models. Compared to the classical Gaussian QMLE and existing robust estimations, it enjoys many distinctive advantages, such as robustness in respect of distributional misspecification and heavy-tailedness of the innovation, more resiliency to outliers, smoothness and strict concavity of the log logistic quasi-likelihood function, and boundedness of the influence function among others. Under some mild conditions, we establish the strong consistency and asymptotic normality of the LQMLE. Moreover, we propose a new and vital parameter identifiability condition to ensure desirable asymptotics of the LQMLE. Further, based on the LQMLE, we consider the Wald test and the Lagrange multiplier test for the unknown parameters, and derive the limiting distributions of the corresponding test statistics. The applicability of our methodology is demonstrated by several time series models, including DAR, GARCH, ARMA-GARCH, DTARMACH, and EXPAR. Numerical simulation studies are carried out to assess the finite-sample performance of our methodology, and an empirical example is analyzed to illustrate its usefulness.

Keywords: Conditional heteroscedasticity model; Heavy-tailed innovation; Identifiability condition; Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation; Robust estimation.

1 Introduction

Time series models play a crucial role across diverse fields, such as data science, economics, finance, engineering, environmental science, epidemiology, healthcare, hydrology, and sociology, among others. Researchers and practitioners often need to model time series data to reveal temporal dependent structures, as well as to understand dynamic mechanisms and patterns in data, to predict future trends, and to make decisions. See, for example, [Box et al. \(2016\)](#), [Peña and Tsay \(2021\)](#), [Woodward et al. \(2024\)](#), etc. In most practical scenarios, the modeling is based on the first two conditional moments. Specifically, a general parametric time series model ([Bardet and Wintenberger, 2009](#); [Ling and McAleer, 2010](#)) takes typically the form

$$y_t = g(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \sigma(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\eta_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_{t-1} = (y_{t-1}, y_{t-2}, \dots)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$, or $\mathbf{Y}_{t-1} = (y_{t-1}, \dots, y_{t-m})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the unknown parameter vector of interest, $g(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) : \mathbb{R}^\infty$ (or \mathbb{R}^m) $\times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) : \mathbb{R}^\infty$ (or \mathbb{R}^m) $\times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ are measurable functions, the innovation sequence $\{\eta_t\}$ is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) with zero mean, and η_t is independent of $\{y_s : s < t\}$.

Model (1) is quite general, containing many classical time series models as special cases. Specifically, when $\sigma(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a fixed positive constant, i.e., $\sigma(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \sigma > 0$, it includes the best known linear time series model, namely the autoregressive moving average (ARMA) model ([Brockwell and Davis, 1991](#); [Box et al., 2016](#)). When $g(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv 0$, model (1) reduces to a general conditionally heteroscedastic time series model

$$y_t = \sigma(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\eta_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2)$$

which includes the celebrated autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity (ARCH) model

([Engle, 1982](#)) and the generalized ARCH (GARCH) model ([Bollerslev, 1986](#)). A fairly comprehensive review of GARCH models is available in [Francq and Zakoïan \(2019\)](#).

In the literature, the Gaussian quasi-maximum likelihood estimation (GQMLE) is widely used for statistical inference of parametric time series models: for example, [Bardet and Wintenberger \(2009\)](#) and [Ling and McAleer \(2010\)](#) for model (1), and [Robinson and Zaffaroni \(2006\)](#) for model (2). Apart from these, there are numerous studies on the GQMLE of many specific parametric time series models, including linear and nonlinear ones. For instance, the GQMLE (asymptotically equivalent to the least squares estimator and the Whittle estimator) of ARMA models has been frequently studied; see, e.g., [Brockwell and Davis \(1991\)](#), [Straumann \(2005\)](#), [Yao and Brockwell \(2006\)](#), [Boubacar Maïnassara and Saussereau \(2018\)](#), and [Wilms et al. \(2023\)](#), among others. For GARCH models, their GQMLE was studied by [Lumsdaine \(1996\)](#), [Hall and Yao \(2003\)](#), [Jensen and Rahbek \(2004\)](#), [Francq and Zakoïan \(2004; 2012\)](#), [Straumann and Mikosch \(2006\)](#), [Jiang et al. \(2021\)](#), [Yu et al. \(2024\)](#), etc. [Francq and Zakoïan \(2019\)](#) provided a quite comprehensive review of the GQMLE of various conditionally heteroscedastic time series models. For the GQMLE of ARMA-GARCH models, see [Ling and Li \(1997\)](#), [Ling and McAleer \(2003\)](#), [Francq and Zakoïan \(2004\)](#), [Ling \(2007\)](#) and the references therein.

Although robust in respect of distributional misspecification of the innovation to some extent, the GQMLE often results in a loss of efficiency ([Francq et al., 2011](#); [Fan et al., 2014](#)), particularly for heavy-tailed time series models.¹ Substantial documented evidence has demonstrated heavy-tailness of the innovation in financial returns, thus ruling out Gaussianity ([Bollerslev and Wooldridge, 1992](#); [Bai, 2003](#); [Li et al., 2023](#)). To improve the efficiency of the GQMLE, many remedial methods were proposed for some specific parametric time series models, including the least absolute deviation estimation ([Li and Li, 2008](#); [Zhu and Ling, 2015](#); [Zhu, 2019](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)), the conditional quantile

¹Heavy-tailed time series data are ubiquitous in the real world. The modeling of heavy-tailed time series data is a long-lasting topic that has been attracting much attention, resulting in a growing number of monographs; see, e.g., [Ibragimov et al. \(2015\)](#), [Buraczewski et al. \(2016\)](#), [Peng and Qi \(2017\)](#), [Kulik and Soulier \(2020\)](#), [Nolan \(2020\)](#), [Nair et al. \(2022\)](#), and [Leipus et al. \(2023\)](#), among others.

estimation (Li et al., 2015; Zheng et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2023), and general M -type estimation (Mukherjee, 2020), etc. A selective overview of contemporary robust statistics is available in Loh (2025). However, these robust estimation methods are often limited in the sense of Huber (1981) due to the non-smoothness of the objective function and the unboundedness of the influence function (Wooldridge, 2020), and therefore still incur potential loss of efficiency and poor performance to a certain extent.

To overcome the shortcomings, Wooldridge (2020) proposed an ingenious logistic QMLE (LQMLE) similar in principle to the GQMLE. Unfortunately, he focused exclusively on the linear regression settings, omitting completely the time series settings. Perhaps the omission is due to the recognition of a serious obstacle to do with the identifiability of the parameters, that is relevant for time series analysis, but not for linear regression. In this article, after overcoming the obstacle, we extend the LQMLE to cover the general time series model (1) and develop a comprehensive procedure based on LQMLE. As far as we know, this article is the first one that fully explores the LQMLE in the context of time series analysis.

We shall assume a different moment condition on the innovation rather than the usual condition $\mathbb{E}\eta_t^2 = 1$. Berkes and Horváth (2004) made a similar point when studying the non-Gaussian QMLE of GARCH models. First, we define

$$\psi(\eta_t) = \mathbb{E}\{h(\eta_t)\} \quad \text{with} \quad h(x) = x\{2F(x) - 1\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (3)$$

where $F(x) = 1/\{1 + \exp(-x)\}$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard logistic distribution. Clearly, $h(x)$ is nonnegative and even; see Figure 1(a). We claim that all parameters are identifiable if $\psi(\eta_t) = 1$, under which the LQMLE is strongly consistent with some extra mild assumptions. Lemma S.4 of the supplementary material justifies the use of $\psi(\eta_t) = 1$. Such a condition relaxes the restriction of $\mathbb{E}\eta_t^2 < \infty$ to $\mathbb{E}|\eta_t| < \infty$ since $2F(x) - 1 \in [-1, 1]$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Further, it is worth noting that the conditional variance of y_t (if exists) is proportional to $\sigma^2(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, without assuming that $\mathbb{E}\eta_t^2 = 1$. This means

that $\sigma^2(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ can still be interpreted as the volatility of models (1)-(2), similar to the interpretation of re-parameterized GARCH models in Fan et al. (2014). For an intuitive understanding of $\psi(\eta_t) = 1$, we give an example as follows.

Example 1. Some examples of distributions satisfying $\psi(\eta_t) = 1$ include: (i) the standard logistic distribution $\text{Logistic}(0, 1)$; (ii) the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ with $\sigma \approx 1.75$; (iii) the uniform distribution $U(-a, a)$ with $a \approx 2.85$; (iv) the Student's t_ν -distributions with degrees of freedom ν , e.g., ct_2 with $c \approx 0.96$ and ct_3 with $c \approx 1.25$; (v) the standard symmetric stable distribution $S(\alpha, 0, 1, 0)$ with $\alpha \approx 1.69$. See Figure 1 for more details.




Figure 1: (a) Plots of $h(x) = x\{2F(x) - 1\}$ and $h(x) = x^2$; (b) Plots of $\psi(X)$ for $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, $\text{Logistic}(0, \sqrt{3}\sigma/\pi)$ and $U(-\sqrt{3}\sigma, \sqrt{3}\sigma)$ with different values of σ ; (c) Plots of $\psi(cX)$ for $X \sim t_2$, t_3 , and t_4 with different values of $c > 0$; (d) Plots of $\psi(X)$ for $X \sim S(\alpha, 0, 0.9, 0)$, $S(\alpha, 0, 1, 0)$ and $S(\alpha, 0, 1.1, 0)$ with different values of α . In (b)-(d), the horizontal dotted lines stand for $\psi(X) = 1$.

The main contributions of this article are fourfold.

First, we propose a novel LQMLE for general parametric time series model (1). Under some mild conditions, it is shown that the LQMLE is strongly consistent and asymptotically normal. Compared to the GQMLE and existing robust estimations in the sense of Huber (1981), our LQMLE enjoys the following advantages: (i) it is robust in respect of distributional misspecification and heavy-tailedness of the innovation; (ii) it is more resilient to

outliers; (iii) the log logistic quasi-likelihood function is smooth and strictly concave; and (iv) the influence function is bounded. These appealing properties simplify computation and statistical inference.

Second, we provide a new condition for model parameter identifiability, namely $\psi(\eta_t) = 1$, which relaxes the restriction $\mathbb{E}\eta_t^2 = 1$ that is almost routinely used in the GQMLE. The new condition allows for heavy-tailed distributions such as the α -stable distributions with $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ and Student's t_ν -distributions with degrees of freedom $\nu \in (1, 2]$. Additionally, for the asymptotic normality of the LQMLE, it suffices to assume a finite second moment of the innovation, equivalent to Assumption 10. This suggests that the innovation following Student's t_ν -distribution with $\nu \in (2, 4]$ is also admissible.

Third, based on the LQMLE, we study the Wald test and the Lagrange multiplier test for the unknown parameters, and develop their limiting distributions. Leveraging the smoothness and strict concavity of the log logistic quasi-likelihood function, we can construct consistent estimators of asymptotic covariance matrices in the above test statistics with ease.

Last, to illustrate the applicability of the proposed methodology, we verify technical assumptions for several nonlinear time series models, namely the DAR, GARCH, ARMA-GARCH, DTARMACH, and EXPAR models. Meanwhile, Monte Carlo simulation studies are conducted to examine the performance of our methodology and an empirical example is analyzed.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the estimation and inference methodology as well as testing, and establishes related theoretical results. Section 3 provides concrete applications of our methodology in several specific nonlinear time series models. Section 4 assesses the finite-sample performance of our methodology by Monte Carlo simulation studies. Section 5 gives an empirical study on treasury yield curve rates. Section 6 concludes. All proofs of main theoretical results as well as additional simulation results are relegated to the supplementary material.

Notations. For any vector \mathbf{a} , we let $\|\mathbf{a}\| = \sqrt{\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{a}}$. $\mathbf{0}_d$ is a d -dimensional vector of zeros. For any matrix \mathbf{A} , we let $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})}$, where $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ denotes the largest eigenvalue of a matrix, and let $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$ be the rank of \mathbf{A} . \mathbb{R}^k is the k -dimensional Euclidean space ($1 \leq k \leq \infty$), and we write $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R}^1$ and $\mathbb{R}^+ = (0, \infty)$. $\mathbb{Z} = \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$ and \mathbb{C} denote the sets of integer and complex numbers, respectively. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we use $x \wedge y = \min(x, y)$. For two positive sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ or $a_n = O(b_n)$ or $b_n \gtrsim a_n$ if there exists a positive constant c such that $a_n/b_n \leq c$. We write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if and only if $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $b_n \lesssim a_n$ hold simultaneously. The symbols ‘ \rightarrow_p ’ and ‘ \rightarrow_d ’ mean convergence in probability and convergence in distribution, respectively. \mathcal{F}_t denotes the sigma-algebra generated by random variables $\{y_j : j \leq t\}$ for each t , i.e., $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(\{y_j : j \leq t\})$. For a given random variable X , $X \in \mathcal{F}_t$ means that X is measurable with respect to (w.r.t.) \mathcal{F}_t .

2 Methodology

2.1 Logistic QMLE with Asymptotics

Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ be the parameter and Θ be the parameter space. Suppose that the observations $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ are from model (1) with the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. To handle the initial value problem involved in optimizing the objective function (4) below, we first let $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_0 = (\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{y}_{-1}, \dots)^\top$ be an initial value and then define $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{t-1} = (y_{t-1}, \dots, y_1, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_0^\top)^\top$ for $t \geq 1$. Denote $\tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = g(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for $t \geq 1$. The (conditional) log logistic quasi-likelihood function is defined as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{\ell}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{\ell}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\log \tilde{\sigma}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log f\left(\frac{y_t - \tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\tilde{\sigma}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right), \quad (4)$$

where $f(x)$ is the density of the standard logistic distribution, i.e.,

$$f(x) = \frac{\exp(-x)}{\{1 + \exp(-x)\}^2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5)$$

The LQMLE of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is defined as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (6)$$

To facilitate the study on the asymptotic properties of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$, we define the theoretical log logistic quasi-likelihood function as

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{t=1}^n \ell_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \text{with} \quad \ell_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\log \sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \log f\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right),$$

where $g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = g(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sigma(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for simplicity.

To obtain the strong consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$, the following assumptions are needed.

Assumption 1. *The parameter space Θ is compact.*

Assumption 2. *$\{\eta_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. symmetric random variables with $\psi(\eta_t) = 1$, where $\psi(\cdot)$ is defined in (3).*

Assumption 3. *$\{y_t\}$ is strictly stationary and ergodic.*

Assumption 4. *There exists a constant $\underline{\sigma} > 0$ such that $\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) > \underline{\sigma}$ a.s. for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$.*

Assumption 5. *$g(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ are continuous functions w.r.t. $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$.*

Assumption 6. *$(g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = (g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0), \sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))$ a.s. if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$.*

Assumption 7. *$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})|^\iota + \mathbb{E} \sigma_t^\iota(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) < \infty$ for some constant $\iota > 0$.*

Assumption 8. *There exists a nonnegative random variable $C_1 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ independent of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and a constant $\rho_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \{|\tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})| + |\tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\} \leq C_1 \rho_1^t$ a.s. for all $t \geq 1$.*

Remark 2.1. *Assumption 1 is standard for parametric time series models. In Assumption 2, the identifiability condition $\psi(\eta_t) = 1$ implies that $\mathbb{E}|\eta_t| < \infty$, requiring only a first-order moment condition on η_t . This relaxes the second-order moment condition necessary*

for the GQMLE (Jeantheau, 1998; Ling and McAleer, 2003). Together with Assumption 6, the restriction $\psi(\eta_t) = 1$ serves as the key identifiability condition on $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. Additionally, the assumption of symmetry of η_t is relatively weak, as it is satisfied by many commonly used random variables. Assumption 3 is commonly used in general nonlinear time series models. Assumptions 4 and 5 are similarly adopted in Jeantheau (1998), Francq and Zakoian (2015), etc. Assumption 4 also implies $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \{\ell_t^+(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} < \infty$. Assumption 7 is mild, requiring only fractional moments on the mean and volatility functions. Assumption 8 is commonly used in existing nonlinear time series analysis literature such as Francq and Zakoian (2015), and the exponential decay rates are satisfied by most stationary time series models. Section 3 below gives some important examples as illustrations. Ling and McAleer (2010) provided a different initial condition, $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |\tilde{\ell}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \ell_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})| = O(t^{-v})$, for some constant $v > 0$ and all $t \geq 1$, which can be guaranteed by assuming $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})| + \mathbb{E} \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \{|\tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})| + |\tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\} = O(t^{-v})$, while we only need $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})|^\iota + \mathbb{E} \sigma_t^\iota(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) < \infty$ for some $\iota > 0$ in Assumption 7, which is weaker than theirs.

The following theorem states the strong consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$.

Theorem 1. *If Assumptions 1–8 hold, then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ a.s. as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

To obtain the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$, we define

$$\mathbf{s}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial \ell_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = -\frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{2\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})} - \frac{2\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})(y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}))/\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{2\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left\{ 1 - 2F\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\dot{\mathbf{g}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \partial g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \partial \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= -\frac{\partial^2 \ell_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top} \\ &= \frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^\top - \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\ddot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{2\sigma_t^4(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left[\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left\{ 2F\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) - 1 \right\} - 1 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^\top}{4\sigma_t^4(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left[\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left\{ 2F\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) - 1 \right\} + 2\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right)^2 f\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top + \dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})\{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^\top}{2\sigma_t^3(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left\{ 2F\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) - 1 + 2\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) f\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{\ddot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left\{ 1 - 2F\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) \right\} + \frac{2\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top}{\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})} f\left(\frac{y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\ddot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \partial^2 \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top$ and $\ddot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \partial^2 g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top$. For the reduced model (2), $\mathbf{s}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\mathbf{H}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathbf{s}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{\dot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{2\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left[\frac{y_t}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left\{ 2F\left(\frac{y_t}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) - 1 \right\} - 1 \right], \\ \bar{\mathbf{H}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{\dot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \{\dot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^\top - \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \ddot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{2\sigma_t^4(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left[\frac{y_t}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left\{ 2F\left(\frac{y_t}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) - 1 \right\} - 1 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\dot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \{\dot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^\top}{4\sigma_t^4(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left[\frac{y_t}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \left\{ 2F\left(\frac{y_t}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) - 1 \right\} + 2 \left(\frac{y_t}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right)^2 f\left(\frac{y_t}{\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) \right].\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \partial \tilde{\ell}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\partial^2 \tilde{\ell}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top$. To obtain the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$, more assumptions are needed.

Assumption 9. *The true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is an interior point of Θ .*

Assumption 10. $0 < \mathbb{E}\{h(\eta_t) - 1\}^2 < \infty$.

Assumption 11. *$g(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{Y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ are twice continuously differentiable w.r.t. $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$.*

Assumption 12. $\mathbb{E}\|\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) / \sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\dot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) / \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\| < \infty$.

Assumption 13. *There exist no non-zero vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathbf{x}^\top \dot{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = 0$ a.s., or there exist no non-zero vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathbf{y}^\top \dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = 0$ a.s.*

Assumption 14. $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{B}_\kappa(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)} \|\mathbf{H}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| < \infty$ for some $\kappa > 0$, where $\mathbb{B}_\kappa(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| \leq \kappa\}$.

Assumption 15. $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \{\|\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{s}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| + \|\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \mathbf{H}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|\} \leq C_2 \rho_2^t$ a.s. for all $t \geq 1$, where C_2 and ρ_2 are defined similarly to those in Assumption 8.

Remark 2.2. *Assumption 9 is standard. Since $h(x) = x\{2F(x) - 1\} \asymp x$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, Assumption 10 is equivalent to that η_t has finite second-order moment, which weakens the finite fourth-order moment condition required for the asymptotic normality of the GQMLE in the literature, allowing innovations to follow the Student's t_ν -distribution with degrees of freedom $\nu \in (2, 4]$. Assumption 11 ensures that $\mathbf{A}_0 := \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{H}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\}$ and $\mathbf{B}_0 :=$*

$\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{s}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\mathbf{s}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top\}$ are well defined. Assumption 12 implies that $\mathbb{E}\|\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top/\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\}^\top/\sigma_t^4(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\| < \infty$, which, together with Assumption 10, ensures that $\|\mathbf{A}_0\| < \infty$ and $\|\mathbf{B}_0\| < \infty$. Assumption 13 ensures that both \mathbf{A}_0 and \mathbf{B}_0 are positive definite. Assumptions 11 and 13 are also imposed by Francq and Zakoian (2015). For the GARCH formulations, Assumption 13 reduces to standard assumptions on lag polynomials. Assumption 14 is standard in the literature (Ling and McAleer, 2010). Assumption 15 is also commonly used in the literature (Francq and Zakoian, 2015), and the decay rates are satisfied for most stationary time series models. Sufficient conditions for Assumptions 14 and 15 are provided in Sections S.3.1 and S.3.2 respectively of the supplementary material to illustrate their connections with the mean and volatility functions.

Remark 2.3. It is noteworthy that when the initial value $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_0$ is finite-dimensional, e.g., $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_0 = (\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{y}_{-1}, \dots, \tilde{y}_{-(m-1)})^\top$, which is met by the DAR and EXPAR models studied in Section 3 below, Assumptions 8 and 15 are satisfied automatically and thus redundant.

The following theorem and corollary state the asymptotic distributions of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ defined in (6) for models (1) and (2), respectively.

Theorem 2. *If Assumptions 1–15 hold, then*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_d, \mathbf{A}_0^{-1}\mathbf{B}_0\mathbf{A}_0^{-1}),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_0 &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{H}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\} = [1 + 2\mathbb{E}\{\eta_t^2 f(\eta_t)\}] \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\}^\top}{4\sigma_t^4(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}\right] + 2\mathbb{E}\{f(\eta_t)\} \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top}{\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}\right\}, \\ \mathbf{B}_0 &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{s}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\mathbf{s}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top\} = \mathbb{E}\{h(\eta_t) - 1\}^2 \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\}^\top}{4\sigma_t^4(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\{2F(\eta_t) - 1\}^2 \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top}{\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 1. *If the conditions of Theorem 2 hold, then for model (2), $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_d, 4\tau\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0^{-1})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\tau = \frac{\mathbb{E}\{h(\eta_t)-1\}^2}{[1+2\mathbb{E}\{\eta_t^2 f(\eta_t)\}]^2}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_0 = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\{\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\}^\top}{\sigma_t^4(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}\right]$.*

In empirical applications, to make statistical inference on $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, we usually need to estimate

the asymptotic covariance matrix $\mathbf{A}_0^{-1}\mathbf{B}_0\mathbf{A}_0^{-1}$. To this end, it suffices to construct weakly consistent estimators of \mathbf{A}_0 and \mathbf{B}_0 , respectively. Let

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_t(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n)\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n)^\top. \quad (10)$$

Theorem 3. *If Assumptions 1–15 hold, then $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n = \mathbf{A}_0 + o_p(1)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n = \mathbf{B}_0 + o_p(1)$.*

In empirical applications, we are often interested in the statistical significance of some specific component of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ in modeling, i.e., testing the hypothesis: $H_{0j} : \theta_{0j} = 0$ v.s. $H_{1j} : \theta_{0j} \neq 0$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Then the Student's t -type of test statistic can be constructed in the form $\mathcal{T}_{nj} = \sqrt{n}(\mathbf{e}_j^\top \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} \mathbf{e}_j)^{-1/2} \hat{\theta}_{nj}$, where the j -th entry of \mathbf{e}_j takes 1 and the rest 0. By Theorems 2 and 3, under H_{0j} , $\mathcal{T}_{nj} \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, for a given significance level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we can reject H_{0j} if $|\mathcal{T}_{nj}| > \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2)$, where $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the quantile function of the standard normal distribution.

2.2 Testing

Consider the hypothesis

$$H_0 : \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \mathbf{r} \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \neq \mathbf{r}, \quad (11)$$

where \mathbf{R} is a $q \times d$ matrix with full row rank, and \mathbf{r} is a q -dimensional vector.

Based on the LQMLE in Section 2.1, we develop the Wald test and the Lagrange multiplier test for the hypothesis (11). Under H_0 , by Theorems 2 and 3, it follows that

$$(\mathbf{R}\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}\mathbf{R}^\top)^{-1/2} \sqrt{n}(\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \mathbf{r}) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_q, \mathbf{I}_q). \quad (12)$$

Then, the Wald test statistic is the inner product of the left-hand side of (12), that is,

$$\mathcal{T}_n^w = n(\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \mathbf{r})^\top (\mathbf{R}\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}\mathbf{R}^\top)^{-1} (\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \mathbf{r}). \quad (13)$$

For the Lagrange multiplier test, we consider the maximization problem (6) subject to the constraint $\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{r}$. The constrained LQMLE $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is defined as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{r}. \quad (14)$$

The Lagrangian of this constrained problem is defined as $\mathcal{J}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + n\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top(\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{r})$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is the vector of Lagrange multipliers. By the Lagrange duality theory, there exists $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n \in \mathbb{R}^q$ such that the solution of (14) is exactly the solution to the unconstrained problem $\arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \mathcal{J}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n)$. Define $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = (\mathbf{R}\mathbf{A}_0^{-1}\mathbf{R}^\top)^{-1}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{A}_0^{-1}\mathbf{B}_0\mathbf{A}_0^{-1}\mathbf{R}^\top(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{A}_0^{-1}\mathbf{R}^\top)^{-1}$. It can be shown that $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{-1/2}\sqrt{n}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_q, \mathbf{I}_q)$. Once we obtain the constrained LQMLE $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$, a plug-in estimator of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ follows, namely $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_n = (\mathbf{R}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}\mathbf{R}^\top)^{-1}\mathbf{R}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}\mathbf{R}^\top(\mathbf{R}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}\mathbf{R}^\top)^{-1}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_n = n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_t(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n = n^{-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n)\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_t(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n)^\top$. Then, the Lagrange multiplier test statistic can be defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_n^{\text{LM}} = n\tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}_n^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_n. \quad (15)$$

The limiting distributions of the Wald test statistic and the Lagrange multiplier test statistic follow from the asymptotics of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ and the continuous mapping theorem.

Theorem 4. *If Assumptions 1–15 hold, then under H_0 : (i) $\mathcal{T}_n^{\text{W}} \rightarrow_d \chi^2(q)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and (ii) $\mathcal{T}_n^{\text{LM}} \rightarrow_d \chi^2(q)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where \mathcal{T}_n^{W} and $\mathcal{T}_n^{\text{LM}}$ are defined in (13) and (15), respectively, and $\chi^2(q)$ is a chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom q with $q = \text{rank}(\mathbf{R})$.*

Remark 2.4. *Another classical large sample test is the likelihood ratio test, which compares the performance of the constrained and unconstrained specifications. In the hypothesis (11), the (quasi-) likelihood ratio test statistic is defined as $\mathcal{T}_n^{\text{LR}} = 2\{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n)\}$. The limiting distribution of $\mathcal{T}_n^{\text{LR}}$ relies on the information matrix equality $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{B}_0$, however, which is generally not satisfied for the cases of distributional misspecifications of innovations.*

3 Applications

In this section, we apply the proposed method and theory to five important time series models in nonlinear time series analysis. We focus on checking relevant technical assumptions used to ensure the asymptotics of the LQMLE.

3.1 DAR Model

A time series $\{y_t\}$ is said to follow a double autoregressive (DAR) model of order (p, q) if it satisfies the stochastic recurrence equation:

$$y_t = \phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \phi_i y_{t-i} + \eta_t \left(\alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^q \alpha_j y_{t-j}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (16)$$

where $\phi_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha_0 > 0$, $\alpha_j \geq 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq q$, $\phi_p \alpha_q \neq 0$, $\{\eta_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with η_t independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . For model (16) with symmetric innovations, [Guégan and Diebolt \(1994\)](#) proved it is strictly stationary and ergodic if the top Lyapunov exponent $\gamma < 0$. Particularly, for $p = q = 1$, it is shown that $\gamma = \mathbb{E} \log |\phi_1 + \eta_t \sqrt{\alpha_1}|$. By Theorem 2.1 in [Cline and Pu \(2004\)](#), a sufficient condition for strict stationarity and ergodicity of $\{y_t\}$ is that $\sum_{i=1}^{p \vee q} (|\phi_i|^2 + \alpha_i \mathbb{E}|\eta_t|) < 1$ with $\phi_i = 0$ for $i > p$ and $\alpha_i = 0$ for $i > q$, and η_t having a continuous and positive density over \mathbb{R} .

Let $d = p + q + 2$, $m = \max\{p, q\}$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\phi}^\top, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top)^\top$ with $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_0, \dots, \phi_p)^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_q)^\top$, $\mathbf{Y}_t = (y_t, \dots, y_{t-m+1})^\top$, $g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \phi_i y_{t-i}$, and $\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^q \alpha_j y_{t-j}^2)^{1/2}$. Assumption 3 is guaranteed by $\gamma < 0$. Assumption 4 is satisfied due to the compactness of Θ . Assumptions 5, 6, 9, 11, and 13 hold automatically. Assumption 7 is satisfied by assuming that $\mathbb{E}|y_t|^\iota < \infty$ for some $\iota > 0$. In addition, note that $\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (1, y_{t-1}, \dots, y_{t-p}, \mathbf{0}_{q+1}^\top)^\top$, and $\dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\mathbf{0}_{p+1}^\top, 1, y_{t-1}^2, \dots, y_{t-q}^2)$. Then, Assumptions 12 and 14 are met by the compactness of Θ and $\mathbb{E}y_t^2 < \infty$, which is implied by Assumption 10 and is not necessary if $q \geq p$. Note that the dimension of the initial value is finite for model (16). Thus, together with Remark 2.3, the proposed LQMLE for the DAR

model (16) is strongly consistent and asymptotically normal.

3.2 GARCH Model

Consider the classical GARCH(p, q) model

$$y_t = \sigma_t \eta_t \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i y_{t-i}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_j \sigma_{t-j}^2, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (17)$$

where $\alpha_0 > 0$, $\alpha_i \geq 0$, $\beta_j \geq 0$ for $i, j \geq 1$, $\alpha_p \beta_q > 0$, $\{\eta_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables and η_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . By [Bougerol and Picard \(1992\)](#), $\{y_t\}$ is strictly stationary and ergodic if and only if the top Lyapunov exponent $\gamma < 0$. Particularly, when $p = q = 1$, it is known that $\gamma = \mathbb{E} \log(\beta_1 + \alpha_1 \eta_t^2)$.

Let $d = p + q + 1$, $m = \infty$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top, \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top)^\top$ with $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_p)^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q)^\top$, $\mathbf{Y}_t = (y_t, y_{t-1}, \dots)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$, $g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv 0$, and $\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \{\alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i y_{t-i}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_j \sigma_{t-j}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}^{1/2}$. On assuming that α_i 's and β_j 's are bounded away from zero and $\gamma < 0$, Assumptions 1–7 and 9–14 can be verified by arguments similar to Section 3.1. Since the dimension of the initial value $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_0$ in optimizing the objective function (4) for model (17) is infinite, we focus on checking the initial conditions. For simplicity, we here consider a GARCH(1,1) model as an example, noting that the discussion on higher-order cases is similar. We know that $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$ since $\gamma < 0$. Let $\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 y_{t-1}^2 + \beta_1 \sigma_{t-1}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1)^\top$. By iterations, we have $\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \alpha_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^{k-1} + \alpha_1 \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^{h-1} y_{t-h}^2$. Without loss of generality, suppose that the initial value is $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_0 = \mathbf{0}$, which is most commonly used in optimizing the objective function. Then $\tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \alpha_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^{k-1} + \alpha_1 \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \beta_1^{h-1} y_{t-h}^2$. Thus

$$\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \alpha_1 \sum_{h=t}^{\infty} \beta_1^{h-1} y_{t-h}^2 = \alpha_1 \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{t+h-1} y_{t-h}^2 = \beta_1^t \left(\alpha_1 \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{h-1} y_{t-h}^2 \right).$$

Let $C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \alpha_1 \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{h-1} y_{t-h}^2$ and $C_1 = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} |C_1(\boldsymbol{\theta})| = \bar{\alpha}_1 \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \bar{\beta}_1^{h-1} y_{t-h}^2$, where $\bar{\alpha}_1 = \sup\{\alpha_1 | \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta\} < \infty$ and $\bar{\beta}_1 = \sup\{\beta_1 | \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta\} < 1$ due to the compactness of Θ and $\gamma < 0$. Clearly, $C_1 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ is a nonnegative random variable independent of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Thus, Assumption 8

is satisfied by letting $\rho_1 = \bar{\beta}_1$. Then, by simple algebraic calculations, we have

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} - \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \left(0, \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{t+h-1} y_{-h}^2, \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \alpha_1 (t+h-1) \beta_1^{t+h-2} y_{-h}^2 \right)^\top,$$

and thus $\|\partial \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} - \partial \tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}\| \leq \beta_1^t [\sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \{\beta_1 + (t+h-1)\alpha_1\} \beta_1^{h-2} y_{-h}^2]$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\|\partial^2 \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top - \partial^2 \tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})/\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top\| \leq \beta_1^t [\sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \{2(t+h-1) + (t+h-1)(t+h-2)\alpha_1/\beta_1\} \beta_1^{h-2} y_{-h}^2]$. Note that there exists a constant ρ_2 with $0 < \rho_2 < 1$ such that $t^2 \bar{\beta}_1^t < \rho_2^t$ for t large enough. Then Assumption 15 is satisfied by adopting the sufficient condition discussed in Section S.3.1 of the supplementary material. Thus, the proposed LQMLE for the GARCH model (17) is strongly consistent and asymptotically normal.

3.3 ARMA-GARCH Model

Consider an ARMA(p, q)-GARCH(r, s) model

$$y_t = \phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \phi_i y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \varphi_j \varepsilon_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t \text{ with } \varepsilon_t = \sigma_t \eta_t \text{ and } \sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \sum_{k=1}^r \alpha_k \varepsilon_{t-k}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^s \beta_l \sigma_{t-l}^2, \quad (18)$$

where $\phi_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $\phi_p \varphi_q \neq 0$, $\alpha_0 > 0$, $\alpha_k \geq 0$, $\beta_l \geq 0$, $\alpha_r \beta_s > 0$, $\{\eta_t\}$ is i.i.d. and η_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . The strict stationarity and ergodicity of the ARMA-GARCH model were studied in Ling and Li (1997), Ling and McAleer (2003), etc.

For illustration, model (18) can be written in the form of model (1). To this end, we let $\phi(z) = 1 - \phi_1 z - \dots - \phi_p z^p$ and $\varphi(z) = 1 + \varphi_1 z + \dots + \varphi_q z^q$ be the p -th and q -th degree characteristic polynomials for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, respectively. Suppose that (i) $\phi(z) \neq 0$, $\varphi(z) \neq 0$ for all $|z| \leq 1$, and $\phi(z)$ and $\varphi(z)$ have no common factors; and (ii) $\sum_{k=1}^r \alpha_k + \sum_{l=1}^s \beta_l < 1$. Then, under (ii), $\{\sigma_t\}$ is stationary (strictly and weakly) and ergodic. Further, $\{y_t\}$ is (causal) stationary, ergodic, and invertible under (i). Thus, by iterations, we can see that $\varepsilon_t = y_t - \phi_0 - \sum_{i=1}^p \phi_i y_{t-i} - \sum_{j=1}^q \varphi_j \varepsilon_{t-j} \in \mathcal{F}_t$. Then the conditional mean function $\phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \phi_i y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \varphi_j \varepsilon_{t-j} \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, i.e., there exists a measurable function $g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ such that $g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \phi_i y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \varphi_j \varepsilon_{t-j}$. Similarly, $\sigma_t^2 \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ by noting that σ_t^2

is a measurable function of $\{\varepsilon_{t-j}^2 : j \geq 1\}$. Due to $\sigma_t > 0$ a.s., we have $\sigma_t \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$. Thus, there exists $\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ such that $\sigma_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\alpha_0 + \sum_{k=1}^r \alpha_k \varepsilon_{t-k}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^s \beta_l \sigma_{t-l}^2)^{1/2}$. Therefore, model (18) has the form of model (1).

For simplicity, we here consider an ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1) model as a benchmark. Specifically, $y_t = \phi_0 + \phi_1 y_{t-1} + \varphi_1 \varepsilon_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$ with $\varepsilon_t = \sigma_t \eta_t$ and $\sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + \beta_1 \sigma_{t-1}^2$. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\phi_0, \phi_1, \varphi_1, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1)^\top$. Suppose that (i)' $|\phi_1| < 1$, $|\varphi_1| < 1$, and $\phi_1 + \varphi_1 \neq 0$; (ii)' $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 < 1$. By Lemma 2.2 in [Francq and Zakoian \(2019\)](#) and the fact $\mathbb{E}|\eta_t| < \infty$ implied by Assumption 2, there exists some constant $\iota > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \sigma_t'(\boldsymbol{\theta}) < \infty$. By iterations, it follows that

$$y_t = \phi_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-\varphi_1)^{k-1} + (\phi_1 + \varphi_1) \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} (-\varphi_1)^{h-1} y_{t-h} + \varepsilon_t. \quad (19)$$

Let $g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \phi_0 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-\varphi_1)^{k-1} + (\phi_1 + \varphi_1) \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} (-\varphi_1)^{h-1} y_{t-h} \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ and $\varepsilon_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{F}_t$. Similar to Section 3.2, we can get that

$$\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \alpha_0 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^{l-1} + \alpha_1 \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^{b-1} \varepsilon_{t-b}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}. \quad (20)$$

Next, we focus on verifying Assumptions 8, 12, 14, and 15, while the others are straightforward to check. By tedious algebraic calculations, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-\varphi_1)^{k-1}, \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} (-\varphi_1)^{h-1} y_{t-h}, \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} [\{(1-h)\phi_1 - h\varphi_1\} y_{t-h} - (h-1)\phi_0] (-\varphi_1)^{h-2}, 0, 0, 0 \right)^\top, \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \left(0, 0, 0, \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^{l-1}, \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^{b-1} \varepsilon_{t-b}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \{(l-1)\alpha_0 + (l-1)\alpha_1 \varepsilon_{t-l}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} \beta_1^{l-2} \right)^\top \\ &\quad - 2\alpha_1 \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^{b-1} \varepsilon_{t-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \dot{\mathbf{g}}_{t-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \end{aligned}$$

Then, Assumption 12 is satisfied by noting that the conditions (i)'–(ii)', the compactness of Θ , and the fact $\mathbb{E}|y_t| < \infty$ implied by Assumption 2. Similarly, Assumption 14 is also satisfied by noting that $\mathbb{E}y_t^2 < \infty$ implied by Assumption 10 and the conditions (i)'–(ii)'.

Without loss of generality, suppose that the initial value is $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_0 = \mathbf{0}$. Then let $\tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) =$

$g(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \tilde{\sigma}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \tilde{y}_t - \tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. It can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= (\phi_1 + \varphi_1) \sum_{h=t}^{\infty} (-\varphi_1)^{h-1} y_{t-h} = \varphi_1^t \left\{ (\phi_1 + \varphi_1) \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{t+h-1} \varphi_1^{h-1} y_{-h} \right\}, \\ \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \alpha_1 \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{t+b-1} \{ \varepsilon_{-b}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{-b}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \} = \alpha_1 \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{t+b-1} \{ \varepsilon_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \} \{ \varepsilon_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \} \\ &= \beta_1^t \left[\alpha_1 \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{b-1} \{ \varepsilon_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \} \left\{ y_{-b} + \varphi_1^{-b} (\phi_1 + \varphi_1) \left(\sum_{h=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{-b+h-1} \varphi_1^{h-1} y_{-h} \right) \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which implies Assumption 8 by similar arguments in Section 3.2. By tedious algebraic calculations, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} - \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} &= \varphi_1^t \left(0, \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{t+h-1} \varphi_1^{h-1} y_{-h}, \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{t+h-2} \varphi_1^{h-2} \{ (1-h-t)\phi_1 - (t+h)\varphi_1 \} y_{-h}, 0, 0, 0 \right), \\ \frac{\partial \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} - \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} &= \beta_1^t \left(0, 0, 0, 0, \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{b-1} \{ \varepsilon_{-b}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{-b}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \}, \alpha_1 \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (t+l-1) \beta_1^{l-2} \{ \varepsilon_{-l}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{-l}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \} \right) \\ &\quad + \beta_1^t \left[-2\alpha_1 \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} \beta_1^{b-1} \left\{ \varepsilon_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{\partial g_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_{-b}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can also obtain that the expressions of $\partial^2 g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T - \partial^2 \tilde{g}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T$ and $\partial^2 \sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T - \partial^2 \tilde{\sigma}_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T$. Then Assumption 15 is satisfied by the sufficient condition discussed in Section S.3.1 of the supplementary material. Thus, the proposed LQMLE for the ARMA-GARCH model (18) is strongly consistent and asymptotically normal.

3.4 DTARMACH Model

Consider a double threshold ARMA conditional heteroscedasticity (DTARMACH) model, proposed by Ling (1999) and defined as

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \phi_0^{(u)} + \sum_{i=1}^p \phi_i^{(u)} y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \varphi_j^{(u)} \varepsilon_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t, \quad a_{u-1} < y_{t-b} \leq a_u, \\ \varepsilon_t &= \sigma_t \eta_t, \\ \sigma_t^2 &= \alpha_0^{(v)} + \sum_{k=1}^r \alpha_k^{(v)} \varepsilon_{t-k}^2 + \sum_{l=1}^s \beta_l^{(v)} \sigma_{t-l}^2, \quad c_{v-1} < y_{t-h} \leq c_v, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $\phi_i^{(u)} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_j^{(u)} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha_0^{(v)} > 0$, $\alpha_k^{(v)} \geq 0$, $\beta_l^{(v)} \geq 0$ for $k, l > 0$ and $u = 1, \dots, U$, $v = 1, \dots, V$, the positive integers b, h are the delay parameters, the threshold parameters satisfy $-\infty = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_U = \infty$, and $-\infty = c_0 < c_1 < \dots < c_V = \infty$, $\{\eta_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables and η_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . The DTARMACH model includes many well-known models such as GARCH, TARMA (Brockwell et al., 1992), and DTARCH (Li and Li, 1996). The strict stationarity and ergodicity of the DTARMACH model were studied in Ling (1999) and a sufficient condition is

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \max_u |\phi_i^{(u)}| < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^r \max_v \alpha_k^{(v)} + \sum_{l=1}^s \max_v \beta_l^{(v)} < 1. \quad (22)$$

The DTARMACH model is a piecewise ARMA-GARCH model and can be regarded as an extension of model (18). To incorporate model (21) into our framework, we assume that the threshold parameters are all known, the sufficient condition (22) holds, and $\sum_{j=1}^q \max_u |\varphi_j^{(u)}| < 1$. Then $\{y_t\}$ is invertible and ε_t can be written as the infinite summation of $\{y_s : s \leq t\}$. For simplicity, let $p = q = r = s = 1$, $d = 3U + 3V$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\phi_0^{(1)}, \phi_1^{(1)}, \varphi^{(1)}, \alpha_0^{(1)}, \alpha_1^{(1)}, \beta^{(1)}, \dots, \phi_0^{(U)}, \phi_1^{(U)}, \varphi^{(U)}, \alpha_0^{(V)}, \alpha_1^{(V)}, \beta^{(V)})^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Denote $I^{(u)}(y_{t-b}) = I(a_{u-1} < y_{t-b} \leq a_u)$ and $I^{(v)}(y_{t-h}) = I(c_{v-1} < y_{t-h} \leq c_v)$. By iterations, similar to (19), it follows that

$$y_t = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{u_1=1}^U \dots \sum_{u_k=1}^U \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \{-\varphi_1^{(u_l)} I^{(u_l)}(y_{t-b-l+1})\} \{\phi_0^{(u_k)} + (\phi_1^{(u_k)} + \varphi_1^{(u_k)}) y_{t-k}\} I^{(u_k)}(y_{t-b-k+1}) + \varepsilon_t,$$

where the convention $\prod_{l=1}^0 \cdot \equiv 1$ is adopted. Further, let

$$g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{u_1=1}^U \dots \sum_{u_k=1}^U \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \{-\varphi_1^{(u_l)} I^{(u_l)}(y_{t-b-l+1})\} \{\phi_0^{(u_k)} + (\phi_1^{(u_k)} + \varphi_1^{(u_k)}) y_{t-k}\} I^{(u_k)}(y_{t-b-k+1}) \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1},$$

and $\varepsilon_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = y_t - g_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathcal{F}_t$. Similarly, we can get

$$\sigma_t^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{v_1=1}^V \dots \sum_{v_k=1}^V \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \{\beta_1^{(v_l)} I^{(v_l)}(y_{t-h-l+1})\} \{\alpha_0^{(v_k)} + \alpha_1^{(v_k)} \varepsilon_{t-k}^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} I^{(v_k)}(y_{t-h-k+1}) \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}.$$

Thus, model (21) has the form of model (1). By similar arguments to Section 3.3, we can

verify Assumptions 8, 12, 14, and 15 hold, while the others are straightforward.

3.5 EXPAR Model

Consider an exponential autoregressive (EXPAR) model of order p :

$$y_t = \sum_{i=1}^p \{\phi_i + \varphi_i \exp(-\delta y_{t-1}^2)\} y_{t-i} + \eta_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (23)$$

where $\phi_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$, $|\phi_p| + |\varphi_p| > 0$, $\delta > 0$, $\{\eta_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables and η_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . The EXPAR model (Jones, 1978; Haggan and Ozaki, 1981) is a nonlinear time series model partly motivated by amplitude-frequency dependency. By Theorem 2.1 in Chen et al. (2018), a sufficient condition for strict stationarity and ergodicity of $\{y_t\}$ in (23) follows that all the roots of the characteristic equation: $z^p - (|\phi_1| + |\varphi_1|)z^{p-1} - \dots - (|\phi_p| + |\varphi_p|) = 0$, are inside the unit circle, and η_t has a continuous and positive density over \mathbb{R} .

Let $d = 2p + 1$, $m = p$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\phi}^\top, \boldsymbol{\varphi}^\top, \delta)^\top$ with $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_p)^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_p)^\top$, $\mathbf{Y}_t = (y_t, \dots, y_{t-p+1})^\top$, $g(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^p \{\phi_i + \varphi_i \exp(-\delta y_{t-1}^2)\} y_{t-i}$, and $\sigma(\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$. Assumptions 1–6, 10, 11, and 13 are satisfied automatically, and Assumption 7 is satisfied by assuming that $\mathbb{E}|y_t|^\iota < \infty$ for some $\iota > 0$. Then note that

$$\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^\top, \exp(-\delta y_{t-1}^2) \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^\top, -y_{t-1}^2 \exp(-\delta y_{t-1}^2) \boldsymbol{\varphi}^\top \mathbf{Y}_{t-1})^\top,$$

and $\ddot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be accordingly obtained. To guarantee Assumptions 12 and 14, it only requires the conditions $\mathbb{E}\|\dot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\ddot{\mathbf{g}}_t(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|^2 < \infty$, which can be verified by using $\mathbb{E}|y_t| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}y_t^2 < \infty$, which are implied by Assumption 2 and 10, respectively. Thus, the LQMLE of the EXPAR model is strongly consistent and asymptotically normal.

4 Simulation Studies

4.1 Performance of the LQMLE

To assess the finite-sample performance of the LQMLE, we consider an ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1) model and a DAR(1,1) model for illustrations in the following examples.

Example 2. *An ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1) model:*

$$y_t = \phi_1 y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t + \varphi_1 \varepsilon_{t-1} \quad \text{with} \quad \varepsilon_t = \eta_t \sigma_t, \quad \sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + \beta_1 \sigma_{t-1}^2, \quad t \geq 1, \quad (24)$$

where $y_0 = 0$, $\sigma_0 = 0$, η_t is generated by one of the six random variables discussed in Example 1, and the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\phi_1, \varphi_1, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1)^\top = (0.3, 0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.3)^\top$ and $(0.2, 0.3, 0.3, 0.1, 0.2)^\top$ in Scenario I and Scenario II, respectively.

Example 3. *A DAR(1,1) model:*

$$y_t = \phi_0 + \phi_1 y_{t-1} + \eta_t (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 y_{t-1}^2)^{1/2}, \quad t \geq 1, \quad (25)$$

where $y_0 = 0$, η_t is generated by one of the six random variables discussed in Example 1, and the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\phi_0, \phi_1, \alpha_0, \alpha_1)^\top = (1.0, 0.5, 0.3, 0.5)^\top$ and $(0.5, 0.2, 1.0, 0.3)^\top$ in Scenario I and Scenario II, respectively.

In each simulation scenario, we use the length of observations $n = 100, 200$, and 400 with 1000 replications. The absolute estimation bias and standard deviation results for each simulation experiment of models (24) and (25) are reported in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. From the tables, we can find that (i) with a larger n , both the absolute estimation bias and standard deviation of each parameter show decreasing trends; (ii) even though it is motivated by the log-likelihood function of a standard logistic distribution when the model innovations come from other distributions, our LQMLE is still consistent, which implies that the LQMLE is robust to distributional misspecifications.

Table 1: The absolute estimation bias and standard deviation results for model (24).

n	Scenario I					Scenario II				
	$\phi_1 = 0.3$	$\varphi_1 = 0.2$	$\alpha_0 = 0.2$	$\alpha_1 = 0.1$	$\beta_1 = 0.3$	$\phi_1 = 0.2$	$\varphi_1 = 0.3$	$\alpha_0 = 0.3$	$\alpha_1 = 0.1$	$\beta_1 = 0.2$
$\eta_t \sim \text{Logistic}(0, 1)$										
100	0.0215 (0.232)	0.0213 (0.236)	0.0439 (0.159)	0.0051 (0.080)	0.0710 (0.374)	0.0050 (0.243)	0.0007 (0.253)	0.0415 (0.197)	0.0040 (0.078)	0.0636 (0.380)
200	0.0072 (0.163)	0.0062 (0.169)	0.0306 (0.124)	0.0036 (0.049)	0.0527 (0.289)	0.0043 (0.160)	0.0041 (0.163)	0.0293 (0.153)	0.0016 (0.050)	0.0506 (0.292)
400	0.0033 (0.106)	0.0033 (0.109)	0.0148 (0.079)	0.0004 (0.033)	0.0293 (0.193)	0.0015 (0.105)	0.0030 (0.105)	0.0143 (0.098)	0.0015 (0.034)	0.0201 (0.189)
$\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$										
100	0.0132 (0.246)	0.0092 (0.258)	0.0381 (0.154)	0.0079 (0.071)	0.0641 (0.379)	0.0001 (0.254)	0.0026 (0.263)	0.0421 (0.197)	0.0048 (0.076)	0.0618 (0.390)
200	0.0161 (0.166)	0.0155 (0.165)	0.0216 (0.106)	0.0005 (0.046)	0.0417 (0.265)	0.0041 (0.165)	0.0033 (0.159)	0.0303 (0.159)	0.0059 (0.047)	0.0350 (0.304)
400	0.0003 (0.107)	0.0017 (0.114)	0.0164 (0.074)	0.0020 (0.030)	0.0274 (0.180)	0.0051 (0.112)	0.0028 (0.109)	0.0129 (0.109)	0.0004 (0.032)	0.0194 (0.211)
$\eta_t \sim U(-2.85, 2.85)$										
100	0.0231 (0.269)	0.0141 (0.276)	0.0431 (0.151)	0.0203 (0.072)	0.0602 (0.418)	0.0007 (0.264)	0.0027 (0.274)	0.0514 (0.205)	0.0200 (0.072)	0.0582 (0.439)
200	0.0038 (0.175)	0.0055 (0.183)	0.0330 (0.121)	0.0091 (0.041)	0.0600 (0.307)	0.0078 (0.179)	0.0036 (0.181)	0.0339 (0.170)	0.0096 (0.040)	0.0514 (0.341)
400	0.0009 (0.116)	0.0023 (0.117)	0.0132 (0.074)	0.0033 (0.026)	0.0265 (0.183)	0.0028 (0.121)	0.0036 (0.120)	0.0214 (0.113)	0.0027 (0.026)	0.0354 (0.220)
$\eta_t \sim 1.25t_3$										
100	0.0159 (0.225)	0.0127 (0.239)	0.0410 (0.160)	0.0080 (0.108)	0.0591 (0.342)	0.0032 (0.223)	0.0033 (0.227)	0.0270 (0.187)	0.0072 (0.105)	0.0464 (0.350)
200	0.0153 (0.163)	0.0140 (0.166)	0.0258 (0.117)	0.0087 (0.073)	0.0505 (0.262)	0.0007 (0.156)	0.0068 (0.157)	0.0266 (0.141)	0.0065 (0.071)	0.0344 (0.263)
400	0.0049 (0.107)	0.0053 (0.112)	0.0117 (0.076)	0.0041 (0.049)	0.0218 (0.182)	0.0021 (0.103)	0.0026 (0.101)	0.0089 (0.101)	0.0031 (0.047)	0.0101 (0.187)
$\eta_t \sim 0.96t_2$										
100	0.0146 (0.234)	0.0114 (0.241)	0.0336 (0.200)	0.0395 (0.214)	0.0580 (0.333)	0.0046 (0.223)	0.0126 (0.211)	0.0198 (0.310)	0.0223 (0.193)	0.0085 (0.358)
200	0.0094 (0.154)	0.0107 (0.160)	0.0164 (0.126)	0.0183 (0.128)	0.0395 (0.266)	0.0035 (0.161)	0.0040 (0.157)	0.0076 (0.157)	0.0324 (0.152)	0.0239 (0.256)
400	0.0004 (0.113)	0.0025 (0.124)	0.0149 (0.103)	0.0187 (0.118)	0.0388 (0.193)	0.0035 (0.110)	0.0044 (0.108)	0.0043 (0.121)	0.0213 (0.119)	0.0186 (0.193)
$\eta_t \sim S(1.69, 0, 1, 0)$										
100	0.0233 (0.249)	0.0130 (0.257)	0.0342 (0.199)	0.0211 (0.185)	0.0653 (0.348)	0.0034 (0.245)	0.0032 (0.247)	0.0242 (0.217)	0.0224 (0.191)	0.0523 (0.352)
200	0.0028 (0.178)	0.0058 (0.184)	0.0195 (0.157)	0.0192 (0.150)	0.0494 (0.260)	0.0033 (0.176)	0.0072 (0.174)	0.0047 (0.170)	0.0164 (0.149)	0.0225 (0.267)
400	0.0046 (0.119)	0.0042 (0.126)	0.0063 (0.083)	0.0133 (0.118)	0.0312 (0.184)	0.0008 (0.113)	0.0012 (0.116)	0.0057 (0.120)	0.0059 (0.086)	0.0231 (0.200)

Table 2: The absolute estimation bias and standard deviation results for model (25).

n	Scenario I				Scenario II			
	$\phi_0 = 1.0$	$\phi_1 = 0.5$	$\alpha_0 = 0.3$	$\alpha_1 = 0.5$	$\phi_0 = 0.5$	$\phi_1 = 0.2$	$\alpha_0 = 1.0$	$\alpha_1 = 0.3$
$\eta_t \sim \text{Logistic}(0, 1)$								
100	0.0217 (0.220)	0.0041 (0.146)	0.0055 (0.166)	0.0080 (0.108)	0.0056 (0.248)	0.0057 (0.137)	0.0269 (0.329)	0.0193 (0.096)
200	0.0146 (0.159)	0.0021 (0.098)	0.0058 (0.115)	0.0055 (0.073)	0.0005 (0.173)	0.0034 (0.097)	0.0294 (0.217)	0.0121 (0.071)
400	0.0074 (0.105)	0.0039 (0.069)	0.0014 (0.076)	0.0009 (0.053)	0.0058 (0.123)	0.0028 (0.067)	0.0044 (0.153)	0.0041 (0.045)
$\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$								
100	0.0339 (0.234)	0.0061 (0.149)	0.0027 (0.144)	0.0071 (0.092)	0.0150 (0.255)	0.0152 (0.143)	0.0283 (0.295)	0.0160 (0.086)
200	0.0152 (0.161)	0.0131 (0.107)	0.0011 (0.099)	0.0067 (0.066)	0.0037 (0.181)	0.0009 (0.099)	0.0128 (0.201)	0.0083 (0.058)
400	0.0105 (0.110)	0.0032 (0.071)	0.0007 (0.065)	0.0029 (0.046)	0.0019 (0.123)	0.0027 (0.069)	0.0099 (0.137)	0.0051 (0.041)
$\eta_t \sim U(-2.85, 2.85)$								
100	0.0484 (0.254)	0.0208 (0.161)	0.0198 (0.095)	0.0141 (0.064)	0.0033 (0.297)	0.0148 (0.151)	0.0017 (0.218)	0.0169 (0.058)
200	0.0209 (0.175)	0.0118 (0.110)	0.0060 (0.068)	0.0064 (0.046)	0.0009 (0.213)	0.0061 (0.102)	0.0078 (0.150)	0.0072 (0.042)
400	0.0120 (0.123)	0.0093 (0.079)	0.0035 (0.048)	0.0033 (0.031)	0.0009 (0.141)	0.0033 (0.072)	0.0067 (0.103)	0.0048 (0.029)
$\eta_t \sim 1.25t_3$								
100	0.0140 (0.209)	0.0000 (0.134)	0.0201 (0.277)	0.0060 (0.177)	0.0183 (0.233)	0.0170 (0.133)	0.0498 (0.463)	0.0105 (0.151)
200	0.0169 (0.139)	0.0070 (0.097)	0.0139 (0.179)	0.0022 (0.110)	0.0078 (0.155)	0.0083 (0.094)	0.0313 (0.292)	0.0068 (0.106)
400	0.0054 (0.097)	0.0010 (0.068)	0.0094 (0.114)	0.0006 (0.079)	0.0013 (0.113)	0.0043 (0.067)	0.0298 (0.219)	0.0019 (0.074)
$\eta_t \sim 0.96t_2$								
100	0.0290 (0.191)	0.0113 (0.129)	0.1099 (0.830)	0.0331 (0.834)	0.0167 (0.196)	0.0186 (0.127)	0.0740 (0.747)	0.0010 (0.291)
200	0.0112 (0.129)	0.0028 (0.086)	0.0337 (0.332)	0.0138 (0.426)	0.0149 (0.134)	0.0097 (0.086)	0.0774 (0.673)	0.0065 (0.298)
400	0.0046 (0.090)	0.0037 (0.065)	0.0276 (0.254)	0.0120 (0.200)	0.0020 (0.094)	0.0051 (0.064)	0.0495 (0.452)	0.0019 (0.174)
$\eta_t \sim S(1.69, 0, 1, 0)$								
100	0.0271 (0.199)	0.0080 (0.137)	0.0739 (0.763)	0.0132 (0.266)	0.0160 (0.217)	0.0132 (0.132)	0.1194 (1.012)	0.0043 (0.294)
200	0.0188 (0.135)	0.0008 (0.094)	0.0311 (0.576)	0.0185 (0.439)	0.0028 (0.158)	0.0079 (0.092)	0.0570 (0.774)	0.0023 (0.224)
400	0.0041 (0.097)	0.0019 (0.066)	0.0142 (0.226)	0.0068 (0.158)	0.0016 (0.105)	0.0042 (0.063)	0.0054 (0.382)	0.0018 (0.194)

Figures 2–5 plot the histograms of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ for models (24) and (25) with $n = 400$, the innovations $\{\eta_t\}$ being generated from i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$ and $1.25t_3$, and the true parameter $(\phi_1, \varphi_1, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1) = (0.3, 0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.3)$ and $(\phi_0, \phi_1, \alpha_0, \alpha_1) = (1.0, 0.5, 0.3, 0.5)$, respectively. The asymptotic standard deviations are calculated from the asymptotic covariance matrix in Theorems 2 through Monte Carlo simulation. It can be seen that the empirical densities of each estimator closely align with the asymptotic normal distributions, despite the absence of finite fourth moments of the innovations, which are generated from a Student's t_3 -distribution. These findings strongly support Theorems 2 and demonstrate

the robustness of the LQMLE compared to the GQMLE.




Figure 2: The histograms of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0)$ for model (24) with $n = 400$, $\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$, and the true parameter $\theta_0 = (0.3, 0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.3)^T$.




Figure 3: The histograms of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0)$ for model (24) with $n = 400$, $\eta_t \sim 1.25t_3$, and the true parameter $\theta_0 = (0.3, 0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.3)^T$.




Figure 4: The histograms of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ for model (25) with $n = 400$, $\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$, and the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (1.0, 0.5, 0.3, 0.5)^\top$.




Figure 5: The histograms of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ for model (25) with $n = 400$, $\eta_t \sim 1.25t_3$ and the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (1.0, 0.5, 0.3, 0.5)^\top$.

Finally, we compare the finite-sample performance of our LQMLE and the GQMLE. As discussed in Remark 2.1, the identifiability conditions for the LQMLE and GQMLE are different so that it is infeasible to fairly compare the finite-sample performance of the LQMLE of parameters in volatility function directly. Thus, we first focus on the estimators of parameters in mean functions, i.e., (ϕ_1, φ_1) in ARMA-GARCH model (24),

and (ϕ_0, ϕ_1) in DAR model (25). In each simulation scenario, we use $n = 100, 200, 400$ with 1000 replications. The absolute estimation bias and standard deviation results for two estimators are reported in Table 3.

Table 3: The absolute estimation bias and standard deviation results of the LQMLE and GQMLE for Scenario I of model (24) and Scenario I of model (25).

n	Scenario I of model (24)				Scenario I of model (25)			
	$\phi_1 = 0.3$		$\phi_1 = 0.2$		$\phi_0 = 1.0$		$\phi_1 = 0.5$	
	LQMLE	GQMLE	LQMLE	GQMLE	LQMLE	GQMLE	LQMLE	GQMLE
$\eta_t \sim \text{Logistic}(0, 1)$								
100	0.0023 (0.232)	0.0033 (0.242)	0.0005 (0.248)	0.0043 (0.261)	0.0368 (0.231)	0.0311 (0.241)	0.0027 (0.145)	0.0007 (0.151)
200	0.0103 (0.156)	0.0087 (0.167)	0.0087 (0.167)	0.0063 (0.178)	0.0172 (0.154)	0.0168 (0.162)	0.0034 (0.099)	0.0023 (0.103)
400	0.0002 (0.107)	0.0007 (0.113)	0.0031 (0.113)	0.0039 (0.120)	0.0067 (0.113)	0.0050 (0.117)	0.0008 (0.072)	0.0003 (0.075)
$\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$								
100	0.0054 (0.241)	0.0027 (0.234)	0.0016 (0.257)	0.0043 (0.247)	0.0274 (0.237)	0.0232 (0.230)	0.0187 (0.149)	0.0183 (0.145)
200	0.0030 (0.165)	0.0013 (0.160)	0.0000 (0.171)	0.0025 (0.166)	0.0179 (0.157)	0.0188 (0.154)	0.0043 (0.104)	0.0042 (0.102)
400	0.0073 (0.109)	0.0057 (0.105)	0.0057 (0.114)	0.0030 (0.110)	0.0069 (0.113)	0.0064 (0.111)	0.0032 (0.076)	0.0022 (0.074)
$\eta_t \sim U(-2.85, 2.85)$								
100	0.0239 (0.274)	0.0200 (0.234)	0.0185 (0.277)	0.0153 (0.239)	0.0416 (0.258)	0.0351 (0.222)	0.0121 (0.151)	0.0097 (0.129)
200	0.0017 (0.174)	0.0009 (0.143)	0.0062 (0.186)	0.0041 (0.153)	0.0215 (0.176)	0.0176 (0.149)	0.0036 (0.113)	0.0031 (0.096)
400	0.0081 (0.119)	0.0067 (0.099)	0.0043 (0.120)	0.0035 (0.101)	0.0133 (0.127)	0.0104 (0.106)	0.0041 (0.076)	0.0037 (0.064)
$\eta_t \sim 1.25t_3$								
100	0.0187 (0.232)	0.0272 (0.332)	0.0168 (0.241)	0.0031 (0.336)	0.0363 (0.215)	0.0353 (0.272)	0.0065 (0.135)	0.0058 (0.183)
200	0.0117 (0.154)	0.0076 (0.237)	0.0087 (0.168)	0.0074 (0.266)	0.0115 (0.149)	0.0100 (0.200)	0.0006 (0.093)	0.0003 (0.125)
400	0.0015 (0.103)	0.0060 (0.190)	0.0007 (0.108)	0.0127 (0.213)	0.0023 (0.101)	0.0021 (0.131)	0.0035 (0.069)	0.0017 (0.092)
$\eta_t \sim 0.96t_2$								
100	0.0105 (0.220)	0.0573 (0.404)	0.0018 (0.234)	0.0055 (0.375)	0.0188 (0.244)	0.0563 (2.323)	0.0104 (0.127)	0.0172 (0.580)
200	0.0018 (0.168)	0.0224 (0.440)	0.0028 (0.175)	0.0506 (0.392)	0.0153 (0.128)	0.0174 (0.282)	0.0067 (0.090)	0.0219 (0.239)
400	0.0037 (0.113)	0.0520 (0.386)	0.0011 (0.119)	0.0267 (0.366)	0.0068 (0.090)	0.0199 (0.453)	0.0012 (0.062)	0.0032 (0.153)
$\eta_t \sim S(1.69, 0, 1, 0)$								
100	0.0207 (0.242)	0.0673 (0.651)	0.0183 (0.256)	0.0100 (0.372)	0.0197 (0.202)	0.0277 (0.430)	0.0084 (0.138)	0.0107 (0.262)
200	0.0065 (0.169)	0.0332 (0.474)	0.0045 (0.174)	0.0459 (0.350)	0.0120 (0.134)	0.0121 (0.430)	0.0070 (0.096)	0.0173 (0.494)
400	0.0032 (0.120)	0.0230 (0.335)	0.0000 (0.118)	0.0323 (0.320)	0.0094 (0.094)	0.0233 (0.290)	0.0048 (0.067)	0.0048 (0.178)

From the table, we can see that (i) when η_t follows the logistic distribution, the LQMLE is indeed the MLE and its outperformance is clear; (ii) when η_t follows the normal distribution, the GQMLE reduces to the MLE and outperforms the LQMLE, which is unquestionable; (iii) when η_t follows the uniform distribution, the GQMLE outperforms the LQMLE

since the uniform distribution is lighted-tailed; (iv) when η_t follows the Student's t_ν and stable distributions, the LQMLE achieves significantly better performance than the GQMLE, which shows that the LQMLE is robust to heavy-tailed innovations. Moreover, the heavier the tail of the innovation, the better the performance of the LQMLE.

To fairly compare the finite-sample performance of our LQMLE and the GQMLE of the parameters in the volatility function, a rescaling technique (Li et al., 2018) can be used to address the issues caused by different identifiability conditions. The related numerical results are presented in Section S.4.1 of the supplementary material, where we have similar findings.

4.2 Performance of the Test Statistics

To examine the finite-sample performance of two tests proposed in Section 2.2, we consider the null hypothesis $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{H_0} = (\phi_{1,H_0}, \varphi_{1,H_0}, \alpha_{0,H_0}, \alpha_{1,H_0}, \beta_{1,H_0})^\top = (0.3, 0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.3)^\top$ and $\mathbf{R} = (1, 1, 2, 3, 1)$ for model (24), and $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{H_0} = (\phi_{0,H_0}, \phi_{1,H_0}, \alpha_{0,H_0}, \alpha_{1,H_0})^\top = (1.0, 0.5, 0.3, 0.5)^\top$ and $\mathbf{R} = (1, 1, 1, 1)$ for model (25). As discussed in Remark 2.2, the asymptotic normality of the estimator requires the innovations with finite variance, thus η_t is generated by one of the first four random variables discussed in Example 1. The nominal significance level is $\alpha = 5\%$. To present the empirical powers, we consider three alternatives $H_1 : \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = 1.1\boldsymbol{\theta}_{H_0}$, $H_1 : \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = 1.3\boldsymbol{\theta}_{H_0}$, and $H_1 : \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = 1.5\boldsymbol{\theta}_{H_0}$ for both two models, respectively. In each simulation scenario, we use $n = 100, 200, 400$ with 1000 replications. The empirical sizes and powers of the hypothesis tests for models (24) and (25) are reported in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

Table 4: The empirical sizes and powers of the hypothesis tests for model (24) at $\alpha = 5\%$.

n	$\theta_0 = \theta_{H_0}$		$\theta_0 = 1.1\theta_{H_0}$		$\theta_0 = 1.3\theta_{H_0}$		$\theta_0 = 1.5\theta_{H_0}$	
	Wald	LM	Wald	LM	Wald	LM	Wald	LM
$\eta_t \sim \text{Logistic}(0, 1)$								
100	0.041	0.031	0.069	0.069	0.420	0.460	0.741	0.821
200	0.022	0.018	0.150	0.155	0.771	0.837	0.933	0.976
400	0.042	0.041	0.317	0.331	0.975	0.993	0.992	0.998
$\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$								
100	0.040	0.024	0.072	0.050	0.491	0.463	0.790	0.865
200	0.034	0.031	0.172	0.150	0.788	0.829	0.952	0.982
400	0.049	0.039	0.368	0.355	0.975	0.993	0.998	1.000
$\eta_t \sim U(-2.85, 2.85)$								
100	0.033	0.038	0.147	0.050	0.595	0.483	0.833	0.864
200	0.048	0.043	0.237	0.132	0.854	0.813	0.964	0.979
400	0.028	0.040	0.491	0.392	0.976	0.986	0.999	0.999
$\eta_t \sim 1.25t_3$								
100	0.037	0.033	0.033	0.070	0.272	0.419	0.606	0.788
200	0.039	0.032	0.063	0.120	0.603	0.765	0.859	0.962
400	0.039	0.032	0.164	0.256	0.914	0.978	0.982	0.996

Table 5: The empirical sizes and powers of the hypothesis tests for model (25) at $\alpha = 5\%$.

n	$\theta_0 = \theta_{H_0}$		$\theta_0 = 1.1\theta_{H_0}$		$\theta_0 = 1.3\theta_{H_0}$		$\theta_0 = 1.5\theta_{H_0}$	
	Wald	LM	Wald	LM	Wald	LM	Wald	LM
$\eta_t \sim \text{Logistic}(0, 1)$								
100	0.061	0.054	0.068	0.040	0.364	0.291	0.668	0.506
200	0.057	0.050	0.133	0.126	0.665	0.643	0.851	0.826
400	0.056	0.052	0.293	0.286	0.947	0.950	0.977	0.971
$\eta_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$								
100	0.045	0.038	0.094	0.053	0.388	0.265	0.634	0.453
200	0.046	0.039	0.156	0.112	0.678	0.614	0.843	0.780
400	0.052	0.048	0.281	0.245	0.921	0.914	0.958	0.955
$\eta_t \sim U(-2.85, 2.85)$								
100	0.058	0.045	0.131	0.042	0.381	0.194	0.595	0.322
200	0.064	0.061	0.172	0.093	0.588	0.448	0.777	0.626
400	0.044	0.046	0.287	0.199	0.873	0.819	0.889	0.836
$\eta_t \sim 1.25t_3$								
100	0.058	0.068	0.048	0.082	0.298	0.348	0.616	0.602
200	0.045	0.046	0.077	0.155	0.628	0.763	0.831	0.921
400	0.044	0.049	0.218	0.312	0.954	0.984	0.962	0.993

From the tables, we can see that (i) for η_t generated by four different random variables, the empirical sizes of the Wald test and the Lagrange multiplier test are close to the nominal significance level $\alpha = 5\%$ in most cases when n is large; (ii) with a larger n , the empirical powers of the two hypothesis tests show increasing trends. For example, under the ARMA-GARCH model (24), for $H_1 : \theta_0 = 1.3\theta_{H_0}$, η_t is generated by $\mathcal{N}(0, 1.75^2)$, when n increases from 100 to 400, the empirical powers of \mathcal{T}_n^W and \mathcal{T}_n^{LM} increase quickly from 0.491 to 0.975, and from 0.463 to 0.993, respectively. Similar simulation studies on a GARCH(1,1) model will be presented in Section S.4.2 of the supplementary material. In summary, our numerical results provide strong support to our theoretical results in Sections 2 and 3.

5 Real Data Analysis

To showcase our method, we consider the U.S. monthly 3-month treasury par yield curve rate series from January 1990 to December 2024 with a total of 420 observations, which are available at <https://home.treasury.gov/>. Denote the data by x_t and $y_t = x_t - x_{t-1}$ as the first difference of x_t . The Phillips-Perron test (Phillips and Perron, 1988) suggests that x_t is not stationary, while y_t can be viewed as stationary. Figure 6 plots the monthly series $\{x_t\}_{t=0}^{419}$ and $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^{419}$, respectively. Li et al. (2023) also studied this dataset (until September 2021) and used an α -stable DAR to fit the series $\{y_t\}$. Their proposed test indicates that the innovation follows a symmetric α -stable distribution with $1 < \alpha < 2$ which corresponds to the heavy-tailed distribution without finite second-order moment.




Figure 6: The U.S. monthly 3-month treasury par yield curve rate series (in percent) $\{x_t\}_{t=0}^{419}$ (left panel), and its difference series $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^{419}$ (right panel).

Then we fit three different models discussed in Section 3, i.e., DAR(1,1), GARCH(1,1), and ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1) models, respectively, to the series $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^{419}$. The fitting results and related statistics of all three models are summarized in Table 6, which provides the following information. First, ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1) model achieves the largest log-likelihood (226.778) and the smallest AIC (-441.555) among these three models, and the parameters $\phi_1, \varphi_1, \alpha_0, \alpha_1$ and β_1 are significant at the significance level $\alpha = 5\%$. Second, the Lyapunov exponents of these three models are $-0.6524, -0.7863$, and -0.6437 , respectively,

which are all less than 0 and indicate that the series is strictly stationary and ergodic. Third, the Hill estimators of the residuals $\{\hat{\eta}_t\}$ in these three models are 0.8163, 0.6716, and 0.7377, respectively, which are all less than 1 and indicate that $\{\hat{\eta}_t\}$ tends to be heavy-tailed. The histograms of the residuals $\{\hat{\eta}_t\}$ in these three models are plotted in Figure 7. Thus, it is more appropriate to model the given using our LQMLE.

Table 6: The fitting results and related statistics of three time series models. In the table, “Est.” means the parameter estimations, and “ASD” means the estimated asymptotic standard deviations, which are calculated by (10) and Theorem 2.

Parameter	DAR(1,1)		GARCH(1,1)		ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1)	
	Est. (ASD)	p -value	Est. (ASD)	p -value	Est. (ASD)	p -value
ϕ_0	0.0015 (0.005)	0.767			0.0017 (0.001)	0.074
ϕ_1	0.3850 (0.070)	0.001			0.8686 (0.037)	0.001
φ_1					-0.7086 (0.039)	0.001
α_0	0.0031 (0.001)	0.001	0.0010 (0.001)	0.121	0.0010 (0.001)	0.034
α_1	0.3323 (0.120)	0.006	0.2867 (0.070)	0.001	0.1779 (0.049)	0.001
β_1			0.3174 (0.102)	0.002	0.4443 (0.093)	0.001
Lyapunov exponent	-0.6524		-0.7863		-0.6437	
Hill estimator	0.8163		0.6716		0.7377	
Log-Likelihood	170.517		206.599		226.778	
AIC	-333.035		-407.199		-441.555	




Figure 7: The histograms of the residuals $\{\hat{\eta}_t\}$ in three fitted models.

6 Conclusion and Discussion

In this article, we have proposed a novel logistic quasi-maximum likelihood methodology in the context of time series analysis. It enjoys numerous advantages. Specifically, it is

robust in respect of distributional misspecification and heavy-tailedness of the innovation, and is more resilient to outliers than the Gaussian quasi-maximum likelihood method and the least squares method. In our asymptotic theory, conditional symmetry of the innovation is assumed, which is mild in practice. When there exist asymmetry phenomena in the data, we can introduce asymmetric structures or threshold effects in time series models to circumvent asymmetry issues.

In this article, we only focus on univariate parametric time series models. There are several topics worthy of further study. For example, with our methodology, we can consider spatial autoregressive models, threshold autoregressive models with unknown threshold parameters, multivariate autoregressive models involving a joint multivariate logistic distribution as in [Malik and Abraham \(1973\)](#). We leave these topics for future research.

Supplementary Materials

The supplementary material contains proofs of all main theoretical results, the technical lemmas with their proofs, the verification of assumptions, and the additional simulation results.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

- Bai, J. (2003). Testing parametric conditional distributions of dynamic models, *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **85**(3): 531–549.
- Bardet, J.-M. and Wintenberger, O. (2009). Asymptotic normality of the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator for multidimensional causal processes, *The Annals of Statistics* **37**(5B): 2730–2759.
- Berkes, I. and Horváth, L. (2004). The efficiency of the estimators of the parameters in GARCH processes, *The Annals of Statistics* **32**(2): 633–655.

- Bollerslev, T. (1986). Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity, *Journal of Econometrics* **31**(3): 307–327.
- Bollerslev, T. and Wooldridge, J. M. (1992). Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation and inference in dynamic models with time-varying covariances, *Econometric Reviews* **11**(2): 143–172.
- Boubacar Maïnassara, Y. and Sausserau, B. (2018). Diagnostic checking in multivariate ARMA models with dependent errors using normalized residual autocorrelations, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**(524): 1813–1827.
- Bougerol, P. and Picard, N. (1992). Stationarity of GARCH processes and of some non-negative time series, *Journal of Econometrics* **52**(1-2): 115–127.
- Box, G. E., Jenkins, G. M., Reinsel, G. C. and Ljung, G. M. (2016). *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*, fifth edn, John Wiley & Sons.
- Brockwell, P. J. and Davis, R. A. (1991). *Time Series: Theory and Methods*, second edn, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Brockwell, P. J., Liu, J. and Tweedie, R. L. (1992). On the existence of stationary threshold autoregressive moving-average processes, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **13**(2): 95–107.
- Buraczewski, D., Damek, E. and Mikosch, T. (2016). *Stochastic Models with Power-Law Tails: The Equation $X = AX + B$* , Springer, Cham.
- Chen, G.-y., Gan, M. and Chen, G.-l. (2018). Generalized exponential autoregressive models for nonlinear time series: Stationarity, estimation and applications, *Information Sciences* **438**: 46–57.
- Cline, D. B. and Pu, H.-m. H. (2004). Stability and the Lyapounov exponent of threshold AR-ARCH models, *The Annals of Applied Probability* **14**(4): 1920–1949.
- Engle, R. F. (1982). Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation, *Econometrica* **50**(4): 987–1007.
- Fan, J., Qi, L. and Xiu, D. (2014). Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation of GARCH models with heavy-tailed likelihoods, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **32**(2): 178–191.
- Francq, C., Lepage, G. and Zakoïan, J.-M. (2011). Two-stage non Gaussian QML estimation of GARCH models and testing the efficiency of the Gaussian QMLE, *Journal of Econometrics* **165**(2): 246–257.
- Francq, C. and Zakoïan, J.-M. (2004). Maximum likelihood estimation of pure GARCH and ARMA-GARCH processes, *Bernoulli* **10**(4): 605–637.
- Francq, C. and Zakoïan, J.-M. (2012). Strict stationarity testing and estimation of explosive and stationary generalized autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity models, *Econometrica* **80**(2): 821–861.

- Francq, C. and Zakoïan, J.-M. (2015). Risk-parameter estimation in volatility models, *Journal of Econometrics* **184**(1): 158–173.
- Francq, C. and Zakoïan, J.-M. (2019). *GARCH Models: Structure, Statistical Inference and Financial Applications*, second edn, John Wiley & Sons.
- Guégan, D. and Diebolt, J. (1994). Probabilistic properties of the β -ARCH model, *Statistica Sinica* **4**(1): 71–87.
- Haggan, V. and Ozaki, T. (1981). Modelling nonlinear random vibrations using an amplitude-dependent autoregressive time series model, *Biometrika* **68**(1): 189–196.
- Hall, P. and Yao, Q. (2003). Inference in ARCH and GARCH models with heavy-tailed errors, *Econometrica* **71**(1): 285–317.
- Huber, P. J. (1981). *Robust Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- Ibragimov, M., Ibragimov, R. and Walden, J. (2015). *Heavy-Tailed Distributions and Robustness in Economics and Finance*, Springer, Cham.
- Jeantheau, T. (1998). Strong consistency of estimators for multivariate ARCH models, *Econometric Theory* **14**(1): 70–86.
- Jensen, S. T. and Rahbek, A. (2004). Asymptotic normality of the QMLE estimator of ARCH in the nonstationary case, *Econometrica* **72**(2): 641–646.
- Jiang, F., Li, D. and Zhu, K. (2021). Adaptive inference for a semiparametric generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity model, *Journal of Econometrics* **224**(2): 306–329.
- Jones, D. A. (1978). Non-linear autoregressive processes, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **360**(1700): 71–95.
- Kulik, R. and Soulier, P. (2020). *Heavy-Tailed Time Series*, Springer, New York.
- Leipus, R., Šiaulys, J. and Konstantinides, D. (2023). *Closure Properties for Heavy-Tailed and Related Distributions: An Overview*, Springer, Cham.
- Li, C. and Li, W. K. (1996). On a double-threshold autoregressive heteroscedastic time series model, *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **11**(3): 253–274.
- Li, D., Tao, Y., Yang, Y. and Zhang, R. (2023). Maximum likelihood estimation for α -stable double autoregressive models, *Journal of Econometrics* **236**(1): 105471.
- Li, D., Zhang, X., Zhu, K. and Ling, S. (2018). The ZD-GARCH model: A new way to study heteroscedasticity, *Journal of Econometrics* **202**(1): 1–17.
- Li, G. and Li, W. K. (2008). Least absolute deviation estimation for fractionally integrated autoregressive moving average time series models with conditional heteroscedasticity, *Biometrika* **95**(2): 399–414.

- Li, G., Li, Y. and Tsai, C.-L. (2015). Quantile correlations and quantile autoregressive modeling, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**(509): 246–261.
- Ling, S. (1999). On the probabilistic properties of a double threshold ARMA conditional heteroskedastic model, *Journal of Applied Probability* **36**(3): 688–705.
- Ling, S. (2007). Self-weighted and local quasi-maximum likelihood estimators for ARMA-GARCH/IGARCH models, *Journal of Econometrics* **140**(2): 849–873.
- Ling, S. and Li, W. K. (1997). On fractionally integrated autoregressive moving-average time series models with conditional heteroscedasticity, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **92**(439): 1184–1194.
- Ling, S. and McAleer, M. (2003). Asymptotic theory for a vector ARMA-GARCH model, *Econometric Theory* **19**(2): 280–310.
- Ling, S. and McAleer, M. (2010). A general asymptotic theory for time-series models, *Statistica Neerlandica* **64**(1): 97–111.
- Loh, P.-L. (2025). A theoretical review of modern robust statistics, *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **12**: 3.1–3.20.
- Lumsdaine, R. L. (1996). Consistency and asymptotic normality of the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator in IGARCH(1, 1) and covariance stationary GARCH(1, 1) models, *Econometrica* **64**(3): 575–596.
- Malik, H. J. and Abraham, B. (1973). Multivariate logistic distributions, *The Annals of Statistics* **1**(3): 588–590.
- Mukherjee, K. (2020). Bootstrapping M -estimators in generalized autoregressive conditional heteroscedastic models, *Biometrika* **107**(3): 753–760.
- Nair, J., Wierman, A. and Zwart, B. (2022). *The Fundamentals of Heavy Tails: Properties, Emergence, and Estimation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Nolan, J. P. (2020). *Univariate Stable Distributions: Models for Heavy Tailed Data*, Springer, Cham.
- Peña, D. and Tsay, R. S. (2021). *Statistical Learning for Big Dependent Data*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Peng, L. and Qi, Y. (2017). *Inference for Heavy-Tailed Data: Applications in Insurance and Finance*, Academic Press, London.
- Phillips, P. C. and Perron, P. (1988). Testing for a unit root in time series regression, *Biometrika* **75**(2): 335–346.
- Robinson, P. M. and Zaffaroni, P. (2006). Pseudo-maximum likelihood estimation of ARCH(∞) models, *The Annals of Statistics* **34**(3): 1049–1074.
- Straumann, D. (2005). *Estimation in Conditionally Heteroscedastic Time Series Models*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

- Straumann, D. and Mikosch, T. (2006). Quasi-maximum-likelihood estimation in conditionally heteroscedastic time series: A stochastic recurrence equations approach, *The Annals of Statistics* **34**(5): 2449–2495.
- Wang, G., Zhu, K., Li, G. and Li, W. K. (2022). Hybrid quantile estimation for asymmetric power garch models, *Journal of Econometrics* **227**(1): 264–284.
- Wilms, I., Basu, S., Bien, J. and Matteson, D. S. (2023). Sparse identification and estimation of large-scale vector autoregressive moving averages, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **118**(541): 571–582.
- Woodward, W. A., Sadler, B. P. and Robertson, S. (2024). *Time Series for Data Science: Analysis and Forecasting*, Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2020). On the consistency of the logistic quasi-MLE under conditional symmetry, *Economics Letters* **194**: 109363.
- Yao, Q. and Brockwell, P. J. (2006). Gaussian maximum likelihood estimation for ARMA models. I. Time series, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **27**(6): 857–875.
- Yu, C., Li, D., Jiang, F. and Zhu, K. (2024). Matrix GARCH model: Inference and application, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* pp. 1–31.
- Zhang, X., Zhang, R., Li, Y. and Ling, S. (2022). LADE-based inferences for autoregressive models with heavy-tailed G-GARCH(1, 1) noise, *Journal of Econometrics* **227**(1): 228–240.
- Zheng, Y., Zhu, Q., Li, G. and Xiao, Z. (2018). Hybrid quantile regression estimation for time series models with conditional heteroscedasticity, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **80**(5): 975–993.
- Zhu, K. (2019). Statistical inference for autoregressive models under heteroscedasticity of unknown form, *The Annals of Statistics* **47**(6): 3185–3215.
- Zhu, K. and Ling, S. (2015). LADE-based inference for ARMA models with unspecified and heavy-tailed heteroscedastic noises, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**(510): 784–794.
- Zhu, Q., Tan, S., Zheng, Y. and Li, G. (2023). Quantile autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **85**(4): 1099–1127.
- Zhu, Q., Zheng, Y. and Li, G. (2018). Linear double autoregression, *Journal of Econometrics* **207**(1): 162–174.