

Functional Factor Regression with an Application to Electricity Price Curve Modeling

Sven Otto[†] Luis Winter[‡]
University of Cologne University of Cologne

March 14th, 2025

Abstract

We propose a function-on-function linear regression model for time-dependent curve data that is consistently estimated by imposing factor structures on the regressors. An integral operator based on cross-covariances identifies two components for each functional regressor: a predictive low-dimensional component, along with associated factors that are guaranteed to be correlated with the dependent variable, and an infinite-dimensional component that has no predictive power. In order to consistently estimate the correct number of factors for each regressor, we introduce a functional eigenvalue difference test. Our setting allows us to construct a novel central limit theorem for the regression parameters in a fully functional model, making it possible to construct confidence bands and conduct statistical inference. The model is applied to forecast electricity price curves in three different energy markets. Its prediction accuracy is found to be comparable to popular machine learning approaches, while providing statistically valid inference and interpretable insights into the conditional correlation structures of electricity prices.

Keywords: Functional linear regression, Factor model, Central limit theorem, Eigenvalue difference test, Electricity price modeling

JEL Codes: C32, C38, C55, Q47

[†]Institute of Econometrics and Statistics—University of Cologne, sven.otto@uni-koeln.de

[‡]Corresponding author: Institute of Econometrics and Statistics—University of Cologne, l.winter@uni-koeln.de

We thank Jörg Breitung, Frédéric Ferraty, Simon Hirsch, Siegfried Hörmann, Dominik Liebl, Alexander Mayer, Oliver Ruhnau, and Fabian Telschow for their valuable comments and suggestions. This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under project number 511905296.

1. Introduction

Empirical economic research increasingly relies on curve-valued data to capture rich, time-varying heterogeneity in economic variables. Recent macroeconomic studies represent heterogeneous household earnings or consumption as entire functions to reflect distributional dynamics (Chang et al., 2024; Bayer et al., 2025), and model term structures of interest rates and inflation expectations as curves (Aruoba, 2019; Inoue and Rossi, 2021). In energy economics, daily electricity price curves are similarly treated as continuous functions (Liebl, 2013; Chen and Li, 2017; Gonzalez et al., 2018). Observing entire curves repeatedly over time requires econometric methods flexible enough to handle infinite-dimensional objects and parsimonious enough to support statistical inference.

When both regressors and dependent variables are curves, linear function-on-function regression presents a natural modeling framework. Despite its intuitive appeal, a key limitation has hindered its widespread use in empirical economics: classical estimators achieve consistency but do not yield asymptotic normality for the functional slope operator. The most common estimation approaches are based on principal components spectral truncation (Imaizumi and Kato, 2018) or Tikhonov/ridge regularization (Benatia et al., 2017). As demonstrated by Mas (2007), Crambes and Mas (2013), and Babii (2020), when regressors truly reside in an infinite-dimensional space, the finite-dimensional truncated part may converge at a parametric rate while the infinite-dimensional remaining truncation tail converges only at a slower, nonparametric rate. This discrepancy prevents weak convergence in the underlying operator norm, making the development of inferential methods for standard errors and confidence bands impossible through conventional central limit theorems. Some workarounds for constructing confidence sets involve relaxing coverage requirements to ensure bands contain the true function at most points in the domain rather than everywhere (Imaizumi and Kato, 2019) or are conservative relying on concentration inequality bounds (Babii, 2020). Hypothesis tests have only been developed for i.i.d. scalar-on-function regression (Cardot et al., 2003) or for the operator norm itself (Kutta et al., 2022). However, functional extensions of standard central limit theorem-based regression diagnostic tools, such as standard errors and confidence bands, are ruled out by this fundamental impossibility result.

This paper overcomes these limitations by developing a novel functional factor regression framework that preserves the flexibility of unrestricted function-on-function regression while allowing for statistical inference known from multiple linear regression. We argue that the predictive information contained in typical macroeconomic functional regressors (e.g., yield curves, inflation expectation curves, energy spot price curves) is confined to a finite-dimensional subspace, while the remaining infinite-dimensional component does not contribute to the regression relationship. For instance, Otto and Salish (2025) provide empirical evidence that the functional autoregression operator of yield and

mortality curves is indeed of finite rank.

This premise leads to an approximate factor structure in which a finite-dimensional factor component of $K < \infty$ factors drives the regression relationship, while the remainder component can be disregarded as it is uncorrelated with all variables in the system. Consequently, the functional slope operator has finite rank and can be identified using the cross-covariance operator between regressor and regressand. This setup naturally extends to multiple functional regressors and accommodates additional scalar covariates and lagged dependent functional variables, making it particularly suitable for functional time series applications.

The core of our estimation approach is the product of the cross-covariance operator with its adjoint, denoted as D , that identifies precisely which directions in the regressor have predictive power for the response variable. Unlike functional principal component analysis, which captures directions of maximum variance in the regressor, our method isolates factors guaranteed to be correlated with the dependent variable. The number of positive eigenvalues of D is K and its eigenfunctions reveal the directions in which the regressor exhibits predictive power. This structure allows us to estimate the corresponding factor loadings from the sample counterpart of D . A similar operator for the purely autoregressive case has been considered by Lam and Yao (2012) and Zhang et al. (2019) in the multivariate literature, and by Bathia et al. (2010) and Otto and Salish (2025) in the context of functional data. Moreover, to consistently estimate the number of factors, we propose a functional equivalent of the eigenvalue difference test proposed by Wu (2018), which exploits the property that the population eigenvalues of D are exactly zero beyond the K -th eigenvalue.

Building on this identification strategy, we develop a consistent estimation procedure that enables valid inference. To estimate the functional slope parameter, we perform an auxiliary regression of the functional dependent variable on the estimated factors using ordinary least squares. Our theoretical results establish that the functional factor regression estimator is asymptotically normal, allowing for the construction of valid confidence bands and hypothesis tests. The asymptotic variance accounts for the uncertainty introduced by the generated regressors problem and allows for heteroskedasticity in the functional error term.

We demonstrate the practical value of our method through an application to electricity market data to model and forecast daily price curves using demand forecasts and renewable energy generation as functional regressors. Our empirical results reveal economically interpretable patterns in how these variables influence electricity prices throughout the day, visualized through three-dimensional coefficient plots with corresponding p-value heatmaps. The interpretation of the estimated bivariate slope coefficient functions is in line with economic theory and extends our knowledge of prevalent correlation structures in power markets. In out-of-sample forecasting performance, our functional factor regres-

sion outperforms both expert and naive models while achieving accuracy comparable to machine learning approaches like LASSO regression, but with the significant advantage of providing interpretable coefficients and valid statistical inference. Our methodology can be applied using our accompanying R package "ffr".

Function-on-function linear regression models have a long tradition in the mathematical statistics literature (see Ramsay and Dalzell, 1991; Bosq, 2000; Yao et al., 2005; Crambes and Mas, 2013; Crambes and Mas, 2013; Hörmann and Kidziński, 2014; Happ and Greven, 2018). While these general frameworks impose fewer restrictions than our approach, they fundamentally cannot permit the construction of functional standard errors. Our key insight is that accepting a finite-dimensional predictive component enables asymptotic normality—if the predictive component were infinite-dimensional, the impossibility result discussed above would apply. The eigenvalue difference test we propose not only consistently estimates K when finite, but also serves to validate this finite-dimensionality assumption empirically, as the criterion would diverge if K were infinite. Our application demonstrates that just 3 to 5 factors suffice to capture the predictive information of functional energy market data.

In contrast to the general infinite-dimensional approach, the simpler case assumes finite-dimensional functional regressors (see, e.g., Hörmann and Jammoul, 2023). Under this stronger restriction, the functional model can be expressed as a well-posed regression with estimators that achieve parametric rates of convergence. While our framework encompasses this as a special case, such models require the covariance operator of the regressors to have finite rank—an overly restrictive assumption that constrains regressors to a finite-dimensional subspace of the function space. Instead, our model requires only the pairwise cross-covariance operators between the functional regressor and response to be of finite rank, while the covariance operator of the regressor itself may have infinite rank.

Notations

Let $H = L^2([a, b])$ be the space of functions $y : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\int_a^b (y(r))^2 dr < \infty$. Together with the inner product $\langle x, y \rangle = \int_a^b x(r)y(r) dr$, $x, y \in H$, and the norm $\|y\| = \langle y, y \rangle^{1/2}$, the space H is a Hilbert space. Every square-integrable bivariate function $\tau : [a, b] \times [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines an integral operator $\mathcal{T} : H \rightarrow H$ such that $\mathcal{T}(y)(r) = \int_a^b \tau(r, s)y(s) ds$ for all $y \in H$. The Hilbert-Schmidt operator norm of \mathcal{T} is $\|\mathcal{T}\|_{\mathcal{S}} = (\int_a^b \int_a^b \tau(r, s)^2 ds dr)^{1/2}$. If κ and v satisfy the eigenequation $\int_a^b \tau(r, s)v(s) ds = \kappa v(r)$, then κ is called eigenvalue and v a corresponding eigenfunction of \mathcal{T} . If $\tau(r, s)$ is symmetric and positive semidefinite, then all eigenvalues are real and eigenvectors corresponding to different eigenvalues are orthogonal.

2. Function-on-function regression problem

Consider the covariance stationary time series of curves $Y_1(r), \dots, Y_T(r)$, defined on the closed domain $r \in [a, b]$, to be our dependent random variable of interest. Moreover, there is a set of $j = 1, \dots, J$ time-dependent covariance stationary functional regressors $X_{jt}(s)$, $s \in [a, b]$, available. Besides that, consider an \mathbb{R}^N valued vector $w_t = (1, w_{2t}, \dots, w_{Nt})'$, including an intercept and covariance stationary random covariates or deterministic control variables like time trends or binary date indicators. A fully functional linear regression model thus takes the form

$$Y_t(r) = w_t' \alpha(r) + \sum_{j=1}^J \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) X_{jt}(s) ds + u_t(r), \quad (1)$$

where $r, s \in [a, b]$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$. As standard in the regression framework, $\alpha(r) = (\alpha_1(r), \dots, \alpha_N(r))'$ and $\beta_1(r, s), \dots, \beta_J(r, s)$ are deterministic coefficient functions while $u_t(r)$ is an error term. The covariance operator Γ_j maps any function $h \in H$ to the function $\int_a^b Cov(X_{jt}(\cdot), X_{jt}(s))h(s) ds \in H$. We assume exogenous regressors with a martingale difference sequence error term:

Assumption 1. (Exogeneity).

Define the information set $\mathcal{F}_{t-i} = \sigma(u_{t-1-i}, w_{t-i}, X_{1(t-i)}, \dots, X_{J(t-i)})$. Then

$$E[u_t(r) \mid \{\mathcal{F}_{t-i} : i \geq 0\}] = 0, \quad \text{for all } r \in [a, b].$$

Our setup includes the functional autoregressive model (Bosq, 2000), where the regressor functions X_{jt} are lags of Y_t . A common identifiability assumption is that the covariance function $Cov(X_{jt}(r), X_{jt}(s))$ is strictly positive definite (Mas, 2007; Imaizumi and Kato, 2018), which implies that $Var(\langle X_{jt}, h \rangle) > 0$ for all $\|h\| > 0$. This condition defines the functional equivalent of the positive definite design matrix condition imposed in classical regression models. However, if the regressor function lives in some subspace of H , then $\beta_j(r, s)$ remains unidentified in the directions where the regressor has zero variance. Therefore, we adopt a weaker condition which restricts the domain of the regression operator to the subspace where the regressor has positive variance (Caponera and Panaretos, 2022). This condition allows for both infinite- and finite-rank covariance operators.

Assumption 2. (Identification I).

$$\beta_j(r, \cdot) \in \overline{Im(\Gamma_j)} \subseteq H, \quad \text{for all } r \in [a, b].^1$$

¹The bar indicates the closure of the set, which is required because $Im(\Gamma_j)$ is not necessarily closed if Γ_j has infinite rank. An equivalent condition, not requiring operator theory, is: $\int_a^b \beta_j(r, s)h(s) ds = 0$ for all $h \in H$ with $Var(\langle X_{jt}, h \rangle) = 0$, and all $r \in [a, b]$.

To illustrate the challenges of estimating model (1), consider, for simplicity, the case $N = 0$ and $J = 1$ with one functional regressor X_t and centered variables, i.e., $E[Y_t(r)] = E[X_t(s)] = 0$ for all $r, s \in [a, b]$. The model equation becomes

$$Y_t(r) = \int_a^b \beta(r, s) X_t(s) ds + u_t(r). \quad (2)$$

It is useful to represent the model in terms of the functional principal components (FPCs) ϕ_l of X_t , which are a sequence of orthonormal eigenfunctions of the covariance operator Γ of X_t , ordered descendingly by their corresponding positive eigenvalues. The FPCs form an orthonormal basis of $\overline{\text{Im}(\Gamma)}$, the subspace where the regression operator is defined according to Assumption 2. In the following, we discuss the two conventional approaches that are usually taken to estimate the simplified model (1). Then, we introduce our novel method which serves as a middle ground between the alternatives.

2.1. Infinite-dimensional regressor with infinite factor structure

Firstly, consider the case where the covariance operator Γ has infinite rank, so that ϕ_l forms an infinite sequence of orthonormal eigenfunctions. The regression coefficient can be represented as

$$\beta(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_l(r) \phi_l(s), \quad b_l(r) = \int_a^b \beta(r, s) \phi_l(s) ds, \quad (3)$$

and the basis representation of the regressor, known as the Karhunen-Loève decomposition, is given by

$$X_t(s) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} x_{lt} \phi_l(s), \quad x_{lt} = \langle X_t, \phi_l \rangle. \quad (4)$$

Equation (4) indicates the infinite factor structure of the regressor X_t , where the FPC scores x_{lt} can be interpreted as the factors, and the FPCs ϕ_l as the orthonormal loading functions of an infinite factor model. By combining (4) and (3), model (2) becomes

$$Y_t(r) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_l(r) x_{lt} + u_t(r), \quad (5)$$

which is a regression on infinitely many regressors x_{lt} . Each coefficient $\beta_l(r)$ is identified by the moment condition

$$E[x_{lt} Y_t(r)] = b_l(r) E[x_{lt}^2],$$

and, by equation (3), the coefficient function has the solution

$$\beta(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{E[x_{lt}Y_t(r)]}{E[x_{lt}^2]} \phi_l(r).$$

Estimating $\beta(r, s)$ is challenging because it relies on infinitely many moment conditions, which results in an ill-posed inverse problem that requires regularization (see Carrasco et al., 2007).

The most common solution is spectral cut-off, where the infinite sum over the FPCs is truncated after \tilde{L} components. The resulting FPC estimator is given by

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{FPC}}(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^{\tilde{L}} \hat{b}_l(r) \hat{\phi}_l(s), \quad \hat{b}_l(r) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{x}_{lt} Y_t(r)}{\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{x}_{lt}^2}, \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{\phi}_l$ are the sample FPCs and $\hat{x}_{lt} = \langle X_t, \hat{\phi}_l \rangle$ the sample FPC scores. Under an appropriate choice of the truncation parameter \tilde{L} as an increasing function of the sample size, consistency results for $\hat{\beta}_{\text{FPC}}(r, s)$ are established by Crambes and Mas (2013), Hörmann and Kidziński (2014), and Imaizumi and Kato (2018), with non-parametric rates of convergence slower than \sqrt{T} . Other regularization approaches include double FPC truncation (see Yao et al., 2005) and Tikhonov regularization (see Benatia et al., 2017; Caponera and Panaretos, 2022). However, it is impossible to prove a central limit theorem for spectral cut-off and Tikhonov regularized estimators for $\beta(r, s)$ in the Hilbert-Schmidt topology (Mas, 2007; Babii, 2020).

2.2. Finite-dimensional regressor with exact factor structure

The regression problem (2) becomes well-posed if the covariance operator Γ has finite rank. This condition has been considered, for instance, in Y. Li et al. (2013), M. Li et al. (2022), and Hörmann and Jammoul (2023). If $\text{rank}(\Gamma) = L < \infty$, then the Karhunen-Loève expansion (4) becomes

$$X_t(s) = \sum_{l=1}^L x_{lt} \phi_l(s), \quad (7)$$

which describes an exact factor model, where the loadings ϕ_l span a finite-dimensional factor space. Equation (5) becomes

$$Y_t(r) = \sum_{l=1}^L b_l(r) x_{lt} + u_t(r), \quad (8)$$

which is a well-posed regression of $Y_t(r)$ on finitely many factors x_{1t}, \dots, x_{Lt} . Hörmann and Jammoul (2023) show that the spectral cut-off estimator has parametric rates of convergence in this case, and methods from multivariate statistics can be used to conduct

statistical inference.

In the functional models commonly used in applied econometrics such as the Nelson-Siegel model for yield curves or inflation expectations (Diebold and Li, 2006; Aruoba, 2019), it is standard to assume that the curves have a finite-dimensional underlying factor structure, especially when the curves are smooth. However, not all FPC scores may be relevant for explaining the linear regression relationship with Y_t , and the number of components L could still be large relative to the sample size T , which still requires regularization to avoid overfitting. Additionally, the FPC basis may not be optimal for functional linear regression, as it indicates directions with the largest variance in the regressor, rather than those with the largest covariance with the dependent variable. As discussed in Otto and Salish (2025), it is more appropriate to identify factors that are directly correlated with the response variable Y_t .

2.3. Infinite-dimensional regressor with approximate factor structure

We propose a new factor model framework by extending equation (7) with an additional error component $\varepsilon_t(r)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} X_t(s) &= \sum_{l=1}^K f_{lt} \psi_l(s) + \varepsilon_t(s) \\ &= F_t' \Psi(s) + \varepsilon_t(s), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with zero mean factors $F_t = (f_{1t}, \dots, f_{Kt})'$ and orthonormal H -valued loading functions $\Psi(r) = (\psi_1(r), \dots, \psi_K(r))'$. The zero mean error component can be infinite-dimensional and relaxes the exact factor model implied from the finite-rank covariance condition in equation (7) to an approximate factor model. The key requirement for separately identifying the factor component $F_t' \Psi(s)$ from the error component $\varepsilon_t(s)$ is that the error component is required to be non-predictive for Y_t , i.e.,

$$\text{Cov}(Y_t(r), \varepsilon_t(s)) = 0, \quad \text{Cov}(f_{lt}, \varepsilon_t(s)) = 0, \quad \text{Cov}(u_t(r), \varepsilon_t(s)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } r, s \in [a, b], \tag{10}$$

while the factors are assumed to be predictive:

$$\int_a^b \text{Cov}(Y_t(r), f_{lt})^2 dr > 0. \tag{11}$$

A direct implication of condition (10) is that the error component satisfies $\int_a^b \beta(r, s) \varepsilon_t(s) ds = 0$. That means it lives in the null space of the regression operator \mathcal{B} mapping any func-

tion $h \in H$ to the function $\int_a^b \beta(\cdot, s)h(s) ds \in H$ (see Lemma 1 in the section on multiple regressors for a detailed proof). Then, the regression coefficient has the representation

$$\beta(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^K \beta_l(r)\psi_l(s), \quad \beta_l(r) = \int_a^b \beta(r, q)\psi_l(q) dq. \quad (12)$$

Hence, the regression operator \mathcal{B} has finite rank because only the finite-dimensional factor component $F_t'\Psi(s)$ is relevant for the regression relationship while the error component, living in the null space of the finite-rank regression operator, can be finite- or infinite-dimensional. In conclusion, our model is more restrictive than the general ill-posed case from Section 2.1 but more general than the well-posed case from Section 2.2 since the regressor X_t can be infinite-dimensional.

The key object to identify all parameters in our approximate factor structure setting is the cross covariance operator C , which is the integral operator with kernel function $c(r, s) = Cov(X_t(r), Y_t(s))$. The product with its adjoint operator is $D = CC^*$, which is the integral operator with kernel function $d(r, s) = \int_a^b c(r, q)c(s, q) dq$. Inserting the factor model (9) into $c(r, s)$ and applying the non-predictiveness condition (10) implies

$$c(r, s) = Cov(X_t(r), Y_t(s)) = (\Psi(r))'E[F_t Y_t(s)],$$

and

$$d(r, s) = \int_a^b c(r, q)c(s, q) dq = (\Psi(r))' \left(\int_a^b E[F_t Y_t(q)]E[Y_t(q)F_t]' dq \right) \Psi(s). \quad (13)$$

Since $\int_a^b E[F_t Y_t(q)]E[Y_t(q)F_t]' dq$ is a full-rank $K \times K$ matrix by the predictiveness condition (11), we have

$$K = rank(C) = rank(D).$$

Moreover, the loading functions $\psi_1(r), \dots, \psi_K(r)$ must be linear combinations of the left-singular functions of C , which are the eigenfunctions of D . These linear combinations are only identified up to a rotation. To see this, note that $(\Psi(r))'F_t = (\Psi(r))'QQ^{-1}F_t$ for any invertible $K \times K$ matrix Q . To fix the rotation, we impose a restriction on the matrix $\int_a^b E[F_t Y_t(q)]E[Y_t(q)F_t]' dq$ that appears in the definition of $d(r, s)$. We assume that

$$\int_a^b E[F_t Y_t(q)]E[Y_t(q)F_t]' dq = diag(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K), \quad \lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_K > 0,$$

which rotates the loading functions such that they are the left-singular functions of C , respectively the eigenfunctions of D , in descending order of singular values, i.e.

$$d(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^K \lambda_l \psi_l(r) \psi_l(s).$$

Because ε_t lives in the null space of the regression operator, we have

$$\int_a^b \beta(r, s) X_t(s) ds = \sum_{l=1}^K \beta_l(r) f_{lt},$$

and model (2) becomes

$$Y_t(r) = \sum_{l=1}^K \beta_l(r) f_{lt} + u_t(r).$$

Hence, $\beta_1(r), \dots, \beta_K(r)$ are the coefficients of a linear regression of $Y_t(r)$ on the factors F_t .

3. Functional factor regression

In this chapter, we extend our findings from Section 2.3 to the general regression framework with multiple non-centered functional variables and additional scalar covariates as introduced in equation (1), i.e.,

$$Y_t(r) = w_t' \alpha(r) + \sum_{j=1}^J \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) X_{jt}(s) ds + u_t(r).$$

Now, every H -valued regressor X_{1t}, \dots, X_{Jt} admits the approximate factor structure

$$X_{jt}(s) = \mu_j(s) + \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} f_{ljt} \psi_{lj}(s) + \varepsilon_{jt}(s). \quad (14)$$

$\mu_j(s)$ is the deterministic intercept function, $F_{jt} = (f_{1jt}, \dots, f_{K_j jt})'$ is the vector of K_j latent factors with $\Psi_j(s) = (\psi_{1j}(s), \dots, \psi_{K_j j}(s))'$ being the vector of corresponding unknown deterministic loading functions and $\varepsilon_{jt}(s)$ is a potentially infinite-dimensional error component.

In addition to Assumption 1 and 2, the following set of restrictions is required to arrive at a fully identified regression model:

Assumption 3. (Identification II).

For any $j = 1, \dots, J$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, and $r, s \in [a, b]$,

(a) The error component of the factor structure is non-predictive and satisfies $E[Y_t(r)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = 0$, $E[F_{jt}\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = 0$, $E[u_t(r)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = 0$, $E[w_t\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = 0$, and $\int_a^b \beta_i(r, q)E[X_{it}(q)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] dq = 0$ for all $i \neq j$.

(b) The factor component is predictive and satisfies

$$\int_a^b E[F_{jt}Y_t(q)]E[Y_t(q)F_{jt}]' dq = \text{diag}(\lambda_{1j}, \dots, \lambda_{K_jj}), \quad \lambda_{1j} > \dots > \lambda_{K_jj} > 0.$$

Moreover, $E[F_{jt}] = 0$ and $\psi_{1j}, \dots, \psi_{K_jj}$ form an orthonormal system in H ,

(c) The vector $z_t = (w_t', F_{1t}', \dots, F_{J_t}')'$ is covariance stationary and has a positive definite covariance matrix.

Assumptions 3(a) and (b) are the multiple regressors extension of the conditions (10) and (11). Part 3(a) ensures that each factor model's functional error term has no predictive power for the dependent variable Y_t . Moreover, the error is uncorrelated with all other variables in the functional regression equation (1). Part 3(b) guarantees that each factor exhibits non-zero correlation with the response variable and serves as a normalization because the loadings and factors are generally only separable up to a rotation matrix. Lastly, Assumption 3(c) rules out perfect multicollinearity in a regression model.

Following the same line of reasoning as in Section 2.3, Assumptions 3(a) and (b) imply that each functional regressor X_{jt} with associated cross covariance operator C_j and the product with its adjoint operator $D_j = C_j C_j^*$ admits the kernel representation

$$\begin{aligned} d_j(r, s) &= (\Psi_j(r))' \left(\int_a^b E[F_{jt}Y_t(q)]E[Y_t(q)F_{jt}]' dq \right) (\Psi_j(s)) \\ &= (\Psi_j(r))' \text{diag}(\lambda_{1j}, \dots, \lambda_{K_jj}) (\Psi_j(s)) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \lambda_{lj} \psi_{lj}(r) \psi_{lj}(s). \end{aligned}$$

Because the eigenequation of D_j follows as

$$\int_a^b d_j(r, s) \psi_{lj}(s) ds = \sum_{k=1}^{K_j} \lambda_{kj} \psi_{kj}(r) \langle \psi_{kj}, \psi_{lj} \rangle = \lambda_{lj} \psi_{lj}(r)$$

by Assumption 3(b), the pairs $(\lambda_{lj}, \psi_{lj})$, $l = 1, \dots, K_j$ are identified as the eigenvalues and their corresponding eigenfunctions of D_j . This directly implies $\text{rank}(D_j) = K_j$. Note how the rank of D_j might differ for each regressor X_{jt} , depending on the number of factors correlated with the regressand.

Given the identified loading functions $\Psi_j(s)$, Lemma 1 shows that each regression coefficient function admits a finite rank representation.

Lemma 1. Under Assumptions 1–3, for any $j = 1, \dots, J$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, and $r, s \in [a, b]$,

$$\beta_j(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \beta_{lj}(r) \psi_{lj}(s) = (B_j(r))' \Psi_j(s), \quad (15)$$

where $\beta_{lj}(r) = \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) \psi_{lj}(s) ds$ and $B_j(r) = (\beta_{1j}(r), \dots, \beta_{K_j j}(r))'$. Additionally, ε_{jt} lies in the null space of the integral operator defined by $\beta_j(r, s)$, i.e., $\int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) \varepsilon_{jt}(s) ds = 0$.

Note that the loading functions $\Psi_j(s)$ are only identified up to a sign change because $m\psi_{lj}$ is still an eigenfunction if ψ_{lj} is an eigenfunction, for any nonzero scalar m . The normalization $\|\psi_{lj}\| = 1$ from Assumption 3(b) does not identify the sign either. However, the sign of the coefficient function $\beta_j(r, s)$ is still fully identified. If the sign of $\psi_{lj}(s)$ changes, the sign of the corresponding $\beta_{lj}(r)$ also flips such that $\beta_j(r, s)$ remains unchanged.

Until here, the last open issue concerns how to obtain $\beta_{lj}(r)$. If we make use of the factor equation (14), the orthonormality of the loading functions, and the fact that ε_{jt} lies in the null space of the regression operator by Lemma 1, the integral term in our regression equation can be written as

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) X_{jt}(s) ds = \beta_0(r) + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \beta_{lj}(r) f_{ljt},$$

where $\beta_0(r) = \sum_{j=1}^J \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) \mu_j(s) ds$. Therefore, the fully functional regression model (1) becomes the functional factor regression

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t(r) &= w_t' \alpha(r) + \sum_{j=1}^J \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) X_{jt}(s) ds + u_t(r) \\ &= w_t' \alpha^*(r) + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \beta_{lj}(r) f_{ljt} + u_t(r) \\ &= z_t' B(r) + u_t(r), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

which is a regression of $Y_t(r)$ on the $(N + \sum_{j=1}^J K_j)$ -dimensional vector of regressors $z_t = (w_t', F_{1t}', \dots, F_{Jt}')'$ with coefficient functions $B(r) = ((\alpha^*(r))', (B_1(r))', \dots, (B_J(r))')'$, where $\alpha^*(r) = (\alpha_1^*(r), \alpha_2(r), \dots, \alpha_N(r))'$ with $\alpha_1^*(r) = \alpha_1(r) + \beta_0(r)$. Under Assumption 3(c), the coefficients are identified as

$$B(r) = E [z_t z_t']^{-1} E [z_t Y_t(r)]. \quad (17)$$

The factors admit a certain representation through projection coefficients, namely

$$\begin{aligned}\langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \psi_{lj} \rangle &= \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} f_{ljt} \langle \psi_{lj}, \psi_{lj} \rangle + \langle \varepsilon_{jt}, \psi_{lj} \rangle \\ &= f_{ljt} + \langle \varepsilon_{jt}, \psi_{lj} \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

We see that the original factors f_{ljt} from equation (14) are latent and only partially identifiable because $\langle \varepsilon_{jt}, \psi_{lj} \rangle$ is unknown. However, the full identification of the factors is not required to identify all parameters of the model (see the discussion in Otto and Salish, 2025). In fact, f_{ljt} coincides with the projection coefficient $f_{ljt}^* := \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \psi_{lj} \rangle$ up to the noise term $\langle \varepsilon_{jt}, \psi_{lj} \rangle$, which is uncorrelated with $Y_t(r)$ by Assumption 3(a). Specifically, the latent factors f_{ljt} and the projection coefficients f_{ljt}^* can be used interchangeably in the functional factor regression (16). To see this, note that by (15),

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) (X_{jt}(s) - \mu_j(s)) ds = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \beta_{lj}(r) \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \psi_{lj} \rangle,$$

which implies that $B(r)$ are the regression coefficients obtained from a regression of $Y_t(r)$ on w_t and $F_{jt}^* = (f_{1jt}^*, \dots, f_{K_j jt}^*)'$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$. Therefore, the regression coefficient functions is identified using either f_{ljt} or f_{ljt}^* .

Before turning to the estimation of the model, we specify the necessary set of assumptions for this task.

Assumption 4. (Estimation).

For any $j = 1, \dots, J$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, and $r \in [a, b]$,

- (a) The vector $(u_t, w_t, X_{1t}, \dots, X_{Jt})_t$ is a weakly dependent α -mixing process of size $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$ for some $\nu \geq 4$ with $\sup_t E[(u_t(r))^\nu] < \infty$, $\sup_t E[(X_{jt}(r))^\nu] < \infty$, and $\sup_t E[(w_{it})^\nu] < \infty$.
- (b) $Y_t(r)$ and $X_{jt}(s)$ have differentiable sample paths, and $\alpha(r)$, $\beta_j(r, s)$, and $\Psi_j(s)$ are differentiable parameter functions.

Assumption 4(a) is sufficient to ensure consistent estimation of all parameters in our model. It only entails fairly mild moment restrictions on the regressors and regression errors, as well as α -mixing at a rate which is common in the literature (see, e.g., White, 2001). Assumption 4(b) is a simple smoothness condition required to achieve a uniform central limit theorem for the functional regression coefficients.

4. Estimation

As all parameters of the regression model are identified by now, we can estimate the population objects based on sample observations. Firstly, we need an asymptotically consistent moment estimator for the integral operator kernel $d_j(r, s)$. Based on that result, consistent estimates of the eigenpairs $(\lambda_{lj}, \psi_{lj})$, $l = 1, \dots, K_j$, follow straightforward. Secondly, the number of factors K_j , equal to the rank of D_j , has been treated as known until here. We introduce a functional equivalent of the eigenvalue difference test suggested by Wu (2018). Lastly, we show that the estimators of the functional regression coefficients $\beta_j(r, s)$ are asymptotically normal with uniform convergence rates. All proofs are supplied in the Appendices A.2–A.4.

4.1. Primitives

Let the sample estimators for the first moment functions be

$$\bar{Y}(r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t(r), \quad \hat{\mu}_j(s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T X_{jt}(s), \quad r, s \in [a, b]. \quad (18)$$

Then, the sample cross-covariance function is

$$\hat{c}_j(r, s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (X_{jt}(r) - \hat{\mu}_j(r))(Y_t(s) - \bar{Y}(s)), \quad r, s \in [a, b], \quad (19)$$

and the respective product of cross-covariance kernels, integrated over the de-meaned response variable $Y_t(q)$, follows as

$$\hat{d}_j(r, s) = \int_a^b \hat{c}_j(r, q) \hat{c}_j(s, q) dq, \quad r, s \in [a, b]. \quad (20)$$

The integral operator \hat{D}_j with kernel function $d_j(r, s)$ has T empirical eigenpairs $(\hat{\lambda}_{lj}, \hat{\psi}_{lj})$ with associated empirical factors $\hat{F}_{jt} = (\hat{f}_{1jt}, \dots, \hat{f}_{K_j jt})'$, $\hat{f}_{ljt} = \langle X_{jt} - \hat{\mu}_j, \hat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle$. In Theorem 1, we prove convergence of the sample primitives to their population counterparts. The convergence proof for \hat{D}_j builds upon consistent estimation of the mean function estimators and the cross-covariance operator \hat{C}_j with kernel function $\hat{c}_j(r, s)$.

Theorem 1. (Primitives). *By Assumption 1–4 and as $T \rightarrow \infty$, for any $j = 1, \dots, J$,*

- (a) $\|\hat{\mu}_j - \mu_j\| = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$ and $\|\bar{Y} - E[Y_t]\| = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$;
- (b) $\|\hat{C}_j - C_j\|_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$ and $\|\hat{D}_j - D_j\|_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$;
- (c) $|\hat{\lambda}_{lj} - \lambda_{lj}| = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$, for $l \geq 1$, where $\lambda_{lj} := 0$ for $l > K_j$;
- (d) $\|s_{lj} \hat{\psi}_{lj} - \psi_{lj}\| = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$, for $1 \leq l \leq K_j$, where $s_{lj} := \text{sign}(\langle \hat{\psi}_{lj}, \psi_{lj} \rangle)$.

4.2. Number of factors

Next, we determine the number of common factors K_j . Popular methods in the multivariate statistics literature consider information criteria as in Bai and Ng (2002) or maximize the ratio of subsequent eigenvalues as in Ahn and Horenstein (2013). Especially the latter approach is attractive for practitioners because it is computationally inexpensive and the respective scree plot allows for simple visual interpretations. However, Xia et al. (2015) formalized that such an estimator might suffer computational instability from 0/0 type ratios. Referring back to our functional factor structure with the specific integral operator kernel $d_j(r, s)$, this problem amplifies. In detail, recall that D_j has rank K_j , meaning all eigenvalues of D_j beyond the K_j -th one are exactly zero. As the estimated eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_{lj}$ converge to their population counterparts by Theorem 1, the Ahn and Horenstein (2013) type ratio estimator $\hat{K}_j^{ER} = \hat{\lambda}_{lj}/\hat{\lambda}_{(l+1)j}$ is not consistent because the $(K_j + 1)$ -th eigenvalue is asymptotically zero and not uniformly bounded away from zero.

To avoid this problem, we propose a functional equivalent of the eigenvalue difference estimator introduced by Wu (2018). Given the kernel function estimator $\hat{d}_j(r, s)$, the proposed method converges to the true number of factors K_j under no additional assumptions.

As in the original paper, the idea is to find a monotonous function which converges to one for the first K_j eigenvalues and to zero for all others. Formalized, we have

$$G(\hat{\lambda}_{lj}) \rightarrow \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } l = 1, \dots, K_j \\ 0, & \text{for } l = K_j + 1, K_j + 2, \dots \end{cases}$$

In order to incorporate the possibility for zero factors, i.e. all eigenvalues of D_j are zero, we define the helper function

$$g_{lj} := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } l = 0 \\ G(\hat{\lambda}_{lj}), & \text{for } l = 1, \dots, K_j^{\max} \\ 0, & \text{for } l = K_j^{\max} + 1, \end{cases}$$

where K_j^{\max} is a user-specified positive constant. The eigenvalue difference estimator then follows as

$$\hat{K}_j^{ED} = \arg \max_{0 \leq l \leq K_j^{\max}} \{g_{lj} - g_{(l+1)j}\}. \quad (21)$$

In the functional factor regression setting, the mock eigenvalue $g_{0j} = 1$ is important because it serves as a simple model specification tool. If the estimator chooses $\hat{K}_j^{ED} = 0$ factors, the respective functional regressor X_{jt} is implied to have no predictive power for the dependent variable and should be dropped from the regression. This feature is derived from the fact that we make use of the singular values of the cross-covariance

operator between X_{jt} and Y_t . In addition to the first mock eigenvalue for $l = 0$, we also add $g_{lj} = 0$ for $l = K_j^{\max} + 1$. If the eigenvalue difference estimator chooses K_j^{\max} factors, the practitioner is advised to redo their analysis with a larger number of possible eigenvalues as it is indicated that $K_j \geq K_j^{\max}$.

Lastly, we discuss the specific transformation function $G(\widehat{\lambda}_{lj})$ needed for the estimator. It takes the form

$$G(\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left(\frac{\gamma \ln(T) \widehat{\lambda}_{lj}}{\sqrt{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \|X_{jt} - \bar{X}_j\|^2} \sqrt{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \|Y_t - \bar{Y}\|^2}} \right). \quad (22)$$

The tuning parameter γ is a freely chosen positive constant. We recommend to set its value according to some standard time series cross-validation procedure that minimizes the mean squared error in a test set. Moreover, the transformation is indifferent to the specific scale of the empirical eigenvalues as we divide all estimates by the integrated sample standard deviation of X_{jt} and Y_t . It is clear that the inverse tangent function converges to $\pi/2$ if its domain approaches infinity and it becomes zero for the input zero. Following this intuition, Theorem 2 proves consistency of the eigenvalue difference estimator for the specific function described in (22).

Theorem 2. (Number of factors). *By Assumption 1–4, $K_j^{\max} > K_j$, $\gamma > 0$, and for any $j = 1, \dots, J$, we have*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} Pr \left(\widehat{K}_j^{ED} = K_j \right) = 1.$$

4.3. Least squares estimator

Estimation of the functional factor regression model builds upon the least squares equation identified in (17). Since the factors are latent unknown in practice, we define the vector of generated regressors

$$\widehat{z}_t := (w'_t, \widehat{F}'_{1t}, \dots, \widehat{F}'_{Jt})'$$

with empirical factors $\widehat{F}'_{jt} = (\widehat{f}'_{1jt}, \dots, \widehat{f}'_{K_j jt})'$, $\widehat{f}_{ljt} = \langle X_{jt} - \widehat{\mu}_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle$. The respective sample estimator for $B(r)$ follows as

$$\widehat{B}(r) = \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \widehat{z}'_t \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t Y_t(r) \right), \quad r \in [a, b], \quad (23)$$

where $\widehat{B}(r) = ((\widehat{\alpha}^*(r))', (\widehat{B}_1(r))', \dots, (\widehat{B}_J(r))')'$ and $\widehat{B}_j(r) = (\widehat{\beta}_{1j}(r), \dots, \widehat{\beta}_{K_j j}(r))'$. The estimator for the j -th functional regression coefficient function as identified in Lemma 1 is

$$\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \widehat{\beta}_{lj}(r) \widehat{\psi}_{lj}(s) = (\widehat{B}_j(r))' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s). \quad (24)$$

For the scalar variables $i = 2, \dots, N$, the coefficient function estimator $\hat{\alpha}_i(r)$ for $\alpha_i(r)$ is the i -th entry of $\hat{B}(r)$, and the intercept estimator is reconstructed as $\hat{\alpha}_1(r) = \hat{\alpha}_1^*(r) - \sum_{j=1}^J \int_a^b \hat{\beta}_j(r, s) \hat{\mu}_j(r) ds$.

A challenge in deriving the asymptotic properties of these estimators lies in the fact that the generated regressor vector \hat{z}_t contains empirical factors instead of the true ones. The following theorem establishes pointwise asymptotic normality and provides asymptotic covariance functions that account for the underlying generated regressors problem.

Theorem 3. (Least squares). *By Assumption 1–4 and as $T \rightarrow \infty$, for any $j = 1, \dots, J$ and $r, s \in [a, b]$, we have*

$$\frac{\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_j(r, s) - \beta_j(r, s))}{\sqrt{\hat{\Omega}_j(r, s)}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where the convergence holds uniformly for $r, s \in [a, b]$ with respect to the sup norm.

The covariance function estimator is given by

$$\hat{\Omega}_j(r, s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(([\hat{Q}^{-1}]_j \hat{z}_t \hat{u}_t(r))' \hat{\Psi}_j(s) + \hat{\omega}_{jt}(r, s) \right)^2, \quad (25)$$

where $\hat{Q} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{z}_t \hat{z}_t'$, $[\hat{Q}^{-1}]_j$ is the submatrix of \hat{Q}^{-1} composed of the K_j rows indexed from $N + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} K_l + 1$ through $N + \sum_{l=1}^j K_l$, $\hat{u}_t(r) = Y_t(r) - \hat{z}_t' \hat{B}(r)$, and

$$\hat{\omega}_{jt}(r, s) = (\hat{\Psi}_j(s))' [\hat{Q}^{-1}]_j \sum_{k=1}^J (\bar{z} \hat{F}'_{kt} - \overline{z F'_k} \hat{G}_{kt}) \hat{B}_k(r) + (\hat{\Psi}_j(s))' \hat{G}_{jt} \hat{B}_j(r) + \hat{\varepsilon}_{jt}(s) \hat{h}'_{jt} \hat{B}_j(r).$$

Here, $\bar{z} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{z}_t$, $\overline{z F'_k} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{z}_t \hat{F}'_{kt}$, $\hat{\gamma}_{lj}(r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_{ljt} (Y_t(r) - \bar{Y}(r))$, $\hat{y}_{ljt} = \langle Y_t - \bar{Y}, \hat{\gamma}_{lj} \rangle$, $\overline{f_{mj} y_{lj}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_{mjt} \hat{y}_{ljt}$, $\hat{\varepsilon}_{jt}(s) = X_{jt}(s) - \hat{\mu}_j(s) - \hat{F}'_{jt} \hat{\Psi}_j(s)$, \hat{G}_{jt} is the $K_j \times K_j$ matrix with (l, m) -entry

$$[\hat{G}_{jt}]_{lm} = (\hat{\lambda}_{lj} - \hat{\lambda}_{mj})^{-1} (\hat{f}_{mjt} \hat{y}_{ljt} - \overline{f_{mj} y_{lj}} + \hat{f}_{ljt} \hat{y}_{mjt} - \overline{f_{lj} y_{mj}}) 1_{\{l \neq m\}},$$

and \hat{h}_{jt} are the vectors of length K_j with l -th entries $\hat{h}_{ljt} = \hat{\lambda}_{lj}^{-1} \hat{y}_{ljt}$.

The additional term $\hat{\omega}_{jt}(r, s)$ captures the uncertainty arising from the estimation of factors and loadings, and is essential for conducting valid statistical inference on $\beta_j(r, s)$. For each fixed pair (r, s) , we define the heteroskedasticity-consistent and corrected standard errors as

$$se_j(r, s) = \frac{\sqrt{\hat{\Omega}_j(r, s)}}{\sqrt{T}}.$$

Given any significance level α and the $(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})$ -quantile $z_{(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})}$ of the the standard normal distribution, these standard errors allow us to formulate a confidence region for $\beta_j(r, s)$:

$$I_j(r, s) = \left[\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) - z_{(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})} se_j(r, s); \widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) + z_{(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})} se_j(r, s) \right].$$

As a direct consequence of Theorem 3, these intervals are asymptotically valid. Specifically, for any fixed $r, s \in [a, b]$,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\beta_j(r, s) \in I_j(r, s)\right) = 1 - \alpha.$$

4.4. Practical implementation

After the methodological technicalities and asymptotics, this section serves as a short summary to help practitioners estimate a functional factor regression. The R package "ffr"² accompanying this paper provides a user friendly application of the following steps.

Step 1: Transform observed data to functions. Normally, empirical functional data is only available stored in high-dimensional vectors. Therefore, construct the response variable and all functional regressors using some standard method such as basis expansion. Common bases choices are natural splines, smoothing splines or B-splines (see Kokoszka and Reimherr (2021) or any other introductory textbook for more detailed information).

Step 2: Estimate the primitives. For each functional regressor $j = 1, \dots, J$, compute the sample means $\bar{Y}(r)$ and $\widehat{\mu}_j(s)$ according to (18), then construct the sample cross-covariance $\widehat{c}_j(r, s)$ from (19) in order to estimate the integral kernel $\widehat{d}_j(r, s)$ as described in (20). Lastly, choose some large enough K_j^{\max} and compute the eigenpairs $\{(\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj})\}_{l=1}^{K_j^{\max}}$, as well the corresponding factors $\widehat{f}_{ljt} = \langle X_{jt} - \widehat{\mu}_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle, l = 1, \dots, K_j^{\max}$.

Step 3: Estimate the number of factors. Set the tuning parameter γ to some positive value or apply any cross-validation technique of your choice. For each functional regressor $j = 1, \dots, J$, use the estimated eigenvalues $\{\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}\}_{l=1}^{K_j^{\max}}$ to determine the number of factors \widehat{K}_j^{ED} according to (21) and (22).

Step 4: Estimate the functional regression. Store an intercept dummy, all relevant factors $\{\widehat{f}_{1t}\}_{l=1}^{\widehat{K}_1^{ED}}, \dots, \{\widehat{f}_{Jt}\}_{l=1}^{\widehat{K}_J^{ED}}$ and any other scalar valued exogenous regressors w_t in a vector \widehat{z}_t , then estimate the regression model for a sufficiently large number of points on the curve $Y_t(r)$ according to (23). Finally, for each functional regressor $j = 1, \dots, J$, use the relevant regression coefficients $\widehat{B}_j(r)$ and the respective eigenfunctions $\{\widehat{\psi}_{lj}\}_{l=1}^{\widehat{K}_j^{ED}}$ to recover the functional coefficient function $\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s)$ according to (24). By calculating each coefficient function's covariance estimator as in (25), statistical inference procedures like hypothesis testing or constructing confidence intervals follow straightforwardly.

²Available from <https://github.com/luiswn/ffr>

5. Simulation

In the following, we verify the favorable finite sample properties of our functional regression estimator and confirm the asymptotic normality results needed for confidence bands and hypothesis tests. In our generic data generating process (DGP), each regressor follows a factor structure defined as

$$X_{jt}(s) = \sum_{l=1}^K f_{ljt}v_l(s) + \sum_{l=K+1}^{3K} \varepsilon_{ljt}v_l(s), \quad s \in [0, 1],$$

where $v_1(s) = 1, v_{(2z)}(s) = \sqrt{2} \sin(2z\pi s), v_{(2z+1)}(s) = \sqrt{2} \cos(2z\pi s)$ is the Fourier basis, the factors are randomly generated according to $f_{ljt} \sim N(0, 1)$, the errors are $\varepsilon_{ljt} \sim N(0, 1)$ distributed and the number of relevant factors is set to $K = 3$. On the other hand, the regression equation follows as

$$Y_t(r) = \int_0^1 \beta_1(r, s)X_{1t}(s) ds + \int_0^1 \beta_2(r, s)X_{2t}(s) ds + \sum_{i=1}^{2K} u_{it}\rho_i(r), \quad r, s \in [0, 1].$$

The bivariate coefficient functions are defined as $\beta_j(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^K v_l(r)\beta_{lj}v_l(s)$, where β_{lj} is deterministically chosen in a way that ensures $\text{rank}(\beta_j(r, s)) = K$ (see Appendix A.5 for the exact specification). Lastly, $\rho_i(r) = \binom{I+1}{i}r^i(1-r)^{I+1-i}, i = 1, \dots, I$, are the Bernstein basis polynomials. We differentiate between homoskedastic regression errors generated from $u_{it} \sim N(0, 1)$ (DGP1), and conditionally heteroskedastic errors defined as $u_{it} \sim N(0, f_{1t}^2)$ (DGP2).

For both data generating processes, the average bias and the pointwise average coverage rate of 95% confidence intervals for the regression coefficient function $\beta_1(r, s)$ are reported. Firstly, the bias of our functional factor regression (FFR) estimator is compared to the theoretically constructed case where the factors and loadings are known and the only error stems from the regression step. Secondly, we present three types of coverage rates which differ by the covariance function estimator used to construct the intervals. In the constructed case with known factors and loadings, the heteroskedasticity consistent (HC) estimator $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T ((Q^{-1}z_t \hat{u}_t(r))' \Psi(s))^2$ is expected to produce bands with asymptotically correct coverage. Next, we report the coverage share with HC covariance estimator but the factors and loadings now have to be estimated themselves beforehand. This case differs from our functional factor regression covariance estimator $\hat{\Omega}(r, s)$ from equation (25) as it misses the correction term $\hat{\omega}_t(r, s)$ which is necessary to account for the generated regressor issue. Therefore, we expect the uncorrected covariance estimator to result in incorrect coverage results while the FFR approach should yield asymptotically accurate rates.

The simulation outcome is displayed in Table 1. To start with the bias results, it

Table 1: Bias and point-wise average coverage rate of 95% CIs for $\beta_1(r, s)$. All results are based on a discrete grid of 200 equidistant points for $r, s \in [0, 1]$ and 5000 Monte Carlo simulations.

| | | $T = 50$ | $T = 100$ | $T = 500$ | $T = 1000$ |
|---------------|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | | Bias | | | |
| DGP 1: Homo | True param. | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | FFR. | 0.011 | 0.005 | 0.001 | 0.000 |
| | Coverage rate | | | | |
| | True param. | 0.906 | 0.928 | 0.943 | 0.944 |
| | Uncorrected | 0.456 | 0.419 | 0.346 | 0.327 |
| | FFR | 0.858 | 0.894 | 0.936 | 0.943 |
| | | Bias | | | |
| DGP 2: Hetero | True param. | 0.004 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | FFR | 0.016 | 0.012 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | Coverage rate | | | | |
| | True param. | 0.881 | 0.915 | 0.940 | 0.942 |
| | Uncorrected | 0.516 | 0.526 | 0.559 | 0.570 |
| | FFR | 0.858 | 0.896 | 0.937 | 0.943 |

becomes apparent that our FFR estimator is consistent as it exhibits a low bias even in small samples which vanishes completely as T increases. This holds for both data generating processes. Regarding the coverage rates, it firstly should be noted how the confidence intervals constructed from the uncorrected covariance are generally incorrect even for large T which is in line with the generated regressors literature. On the other hand, our FFR coverage rates as described in Theorem 3 asymptotically converge to the true value 0.95. These rates are of comparable size as the ones obtained from the unfeasible estimator with known factors and loadings and no first-stage error.

Lastly, we examine the finite sample properties of the functional eigenvalue difference test introduced in Chapter 4.2 by determining the number relevant factors for $X_{1t}(s)$. The data generating process remains the same as above, we only change the number of factors K between 3, 5 and 7. Figure 1 shows that the estimator yields robustly correct results for all cases, even in settings with relatively small samples. The estimator lacks some precision when the number of observations drops below 50. Moreover, it is noticeable that this issue amplifies with a larger number of factors K .

6. Application to electricity price curve modeling

In this section, we apply the functional factor regression method to model and forecast electricity spot prices in three different markets. For this task, understanding the institutional power market framework first is necessary. The European and North American




Figure 1: Simulation performance of the functional eigenvalue difference test applied to $X_{1t}(s)$ with 5000 Monte Carlo repetitions for different numbers of relevant factors K . The y-axis shows the share of correctly estimated cases during the 5000 simulations. The tuning parameter is set to $\gamma = 1$.

wholesale short-term power trading is set-up as a one day ahead price auction. The 24 hourly spot prices for the next day are simultaneously settled when the gates close at 12 p.m. noon. Furthermore, substantial relevant information for this price setting mechanism is widely accessible to all market participants. The European Network of Transmission System Operators (ENTSO-E) exemplifies this type of comprehensive data source. The association provided with a legal mandate by the European Union requires its local transmission system operators (TSOs) to publish one day ahead load (i.e. demand) forecasts at least two hours before the gate closure time³. Hence, it seems like a feasible goal to retrace the publicly available data which serves as a lower bound of the information set that wholesale traders make use of to buy and sell electricity⁴.

On the other hand, there are clear economic motives for this modeling and forecasting task. Firstly, electricity still can not be stored efficiently. Therefore, demand spikes result in potentially untempered spot price fluctuations (Liebl, 2013). Secondly, increasing shares of renewable energy sources in the European electricity mix make the power generation more volatile which directly impacts energy price volatility (Lago et al., 2021). Modeling these relationships is therefore a promising avenue to achieve accurate price forecasts. Precise predictions, in turn, create substantial economic value across the market: individual generators can optimize their production schedules to maximize profits during high-price periods, large industrial consumers can shift energy-intensive operations to lower-price intervals to reduce costs, and traders can identify profitable arbitrage opportunities between day-ahead and real-time markets, enhancing overall market liquidity and efficiency.

Following from the simultaneous auction based price setting, electricity spot prices are usually considered 24-dimensional multivariate time series (Uniejewski et al., 2016). However, neighboring data points are highly correlated and plots reveal that inter-day

³<https://transparency.entsoe.eu/>

⁴For an extensive discussion of the European electricity spot market design, see Bichler et al. (2021)




Figure 2: Energy market variables from the German EPEX-DE data set provided by Lago et al. (2021). Each plot consists of 100 consecutive daily sample curves.

price data can be considered functional observations with regard to some intra-day time unit (e.g. hours, minutes, seconds, etc.). Figure 2 shows 100 sample functions for three different energy market related variables to highlight this point. Hence, we model spot prices using our functional factor regression approach. The goal is not only to forecast but specifically reveal and interpret conditional correlation structures in this market through statistical inference. While our consistently estimated model parameters in combination with the novel central limit theorem allow for this task, alternative estimation techniques like regularization methods which are necessary to handle the high-dimensional data are often hardly interpretable and require additional post-estimation steps for valid inference (see, for example, Lee et al. (2016)).

The data set we consider is provided by Lago et al. (2021). The "open-access benchmark" energy data set that entails relevant regressor variables for five different power markets. Focusing on the German electricity market first, the data spans 2184 days (i.e. six 364-day "years") between 2012 and 2017. In our forecasting exercise, the first four years are assigned to model training and the remaining two years are used for forecast evaluation. Besides the hourly spot prices obtained from the European Power Exchange (EPEX), two exogenous regressors observed at the same frequency are available. Firstly, the day ahead load forecast in the TSO Amprion zone which mainly covers the whole of

Table 2: Results from the functional eigenvalue difference test introduced in section 4.2 for the nine regressors specified in equation (26). The optimal tuning parameter $\gamma = 93$ was found through cross-validation.

| Regressor | P_{t-1} | P_{t-2} | P_{t-5} | L_t | L_{t-1} | L_{t-5} | G_t | G_{t-1} | G_{t-5} |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| $\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{\text{ED}}$ | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 |

Western Germany. Load is a measure of the power absorbed by all installations connected to the transmission or distribution network. In economic terms, it can be understood as electricity consumption or demand. As described above, this day-ahead demand forecast is publicly available on the ENTSO-E transparency platform two hours before each daily auction. Secondly, the data set provides day ahead wind and solar generation forecasts in the three largest TSO zones. The variable is a supply-side measure and freely available on the system operators' websites.


We set up the following fully-functional regression model in order to study German electricity spot prices:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_t(r) = & w_t' \alpha(r) + \int_0^1 \varphi_1(r, s) P_{t-1}(s) ds + \int_0^1 \varphi_2(r, s) P_{t-2}(s) ds + \int_0^1 \varphi_5(r, s) P_{t-5}(s) ds \\
& + \int_0^1 \beta_{1,1}(r, s) L_t(s) ds + \int_0^1 \beta_{1,2}(r, s) L_{t-1}(s) ds + \int_0^1 \beta_{1,5}(r, s) L_{t-5}(s) ds \\
& + \int_0^1 \beta_{2,1}(r, s) G_t(s) ds + \int_0^1 \beta_{2,2}(r, s) G_{t-1}(s) ds + \int_0^1 \beta_{2,5}(r, s) G_{t-5}(s) ds + u_t(r).
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$


$P_t(r)$ describes the daily price curve, $L_t(s)$ is the curve of load forecasts for day t available one day before, $G_t(s)$ is the curve of wind and solar generation forecasts for day t available one day before, and w_t stores the intercept, as well as one-hot encoded weekday dummies. Because only weekdays are considered in all subsequent analyses, the chosen regressor dynamics are one day lags, two days lags and one week (i.e five days) lags. The intra-day time domains r and s are scaled to lie on the unit interval $[0, 1]$. We restrain from normalizing the data in order to provide straight-forward interpretation of the functional regression parameters.

The regression model (26) is estimated as explained in chapter 4. Table 2 shows the eigenvalue difference test results for the number of factors K_j for each of the nine functional regressors. By splitting the data 60/40 and performing an expanding window cross-validation with regard to the one day ahead forecasting performance, we find an optimal tuning parameter of $\gamma = 93$.

Because the regression coefficients are uni- and bivariate functions, we require a visual interpretation. Figure 3 shows heatmap plots of the three functional slope coefficients associated with P_{t-1} , L_t and G_t . The first plot visualizes the impact of yesterday's



(a) $\hat{\varphi}_1(r, s)$: impact of last working day's price $P_{t-1}(s)$ on today's price $P_t(r)$. (b) $\hat{\beta}_{1,1}(r, s)$: impact of day-ahead load forecast $L_t(s)$ on today's price $P_t(r)$.



(c) $\hat{\beta}_{2,1}(r, s)$: impact of day-ahead wind and solar generation forecast $G_t(s)$ on today's price $P_t(r)$.


Figure 3: Estimated functional regression coefficients of model (26). The number of factors chosen to estimate the functional parameters in figure 3a–3c are shown in Table 2. The underlying German power market data spans all working days between 2012 and 2017.

spot price at hour s on today's price at hour r (Figure 3a). To begin with, the positive diagonal values indicate price persistence as higher one-day-before prices lead to price increases at the same hour today. At the peak, a 1 Euro per MWh increase in yesterday's 8 p.m. price leads to an average 4.92 Euro per MWh increase in today's 7 p.m. price, *ceteris paribus*. Secondly, the coefficient plot reveals three separately interpretable regions of positive values on the surface. Looking at the red area in the bottom left of the plot, we see that yesterday's prices between midnight and roughly 7 a.m. mostly impact today's nighttime prices. The second field is marked by the four peaks at around 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. yesterday and today. Similarly to the first field, this surface shows how working hour electricity prices can mainly be explained by yesterday's working hour prices. While the 8 p.m. peak is expected, it is striking that the last day's 8 p.m. evening price is also a strong signal for the next day's 8 a.m. morning price. Lastly, the coefficient

plot shows that the previous day's last hourly prices heavily influences all prices of the following day which is in line with the "end-of-day effect" described in Maciejowska and Nowotarski (2016) and Ziel (2016). Since our model already controls for electricity load forecasts and renewable energy generation, the observed price persistence patterns likely reflect market dynamics beyond the merit order effect. The temporal dependencies can stem from several potential mechanisms. Primarily, market participants might use the recent price history as anchoring points for their current bidding strategies. In addition, operational constraints like minimum up/down times and ramping limitations of power plants likely lead to temporal dependencies. The distinct day and night pattern might reflect different market regimes like liquidity differences or changes in the composition of market participants. To validate these findings statistically, Figure 4a presents pointwise p-values from a two-tailed t-test on difference to zero based on our new central limit theorem. The dark red areas within the solid contour lines indicate p-values smaller than 0.01. The test result confirms the significance of three price patterns: same-hour effects, nighttime price links, and end-of-day influences. Hence, our paper delivers support for the end-of-day effect hypothesis beyond the simple interpretation of unconditional correlation structures.

The day-ahead load forecast coefficient function (Figure 3b) shows how expected demand affects prices. The positive values along the diagonal and its adjacent hours align with economic theory as higher demand forecasts lead to higher prices. Quantitatively, a 1 GW increase in the 8 a.m. load forecast corresponds to an average 21.64 Euro per MWh increase in the contemporaneous spot price, *ceteris paribus*. While the strongly negative relationship between afternoon load forecasts and night/morning prices appears difficult to interpret, the corresponding p-value heatmap (Figure 4b) indicates that this effect lacks statistical significance. In fact, our inference result reveals that load forecasts overall play a surprisingly minor role in explaining electricity prices when conditioning on renewable energy generation forecasts and lagged prices.

Lastly, the supply-side effects are captured by the day-ahead wind and solar generation forecast coefficient function in Figure 3c. In line with theory, the diagonal shows strongly negative values, indicating that higher renewable forecasts reduce prices in the corresponding hour. The directly adjacent off-diagonals, however, show substantial positive influences, suggesting the presence of ramping costs. This pattern emerges as conventional producers must recover the additional costs incurred from cycling their power plants in response to fluctuating renewable generation. When high renewable output is forecasted, conventional generators face a choice between reducing output and incurring ramping costs, shutting down entirely and incurring shutdown and later startup costs, or running at minimum load with a potential loss during peak renewable hours. To recover these costs, generators likely increase their bids in hours surrounding the high renewable periods, leading to higher prices in these adjacent hours. When examining the respective



(a) p -values for $\hat{\varphi}_1(r, s)$

(b) p -values for $\hat{\beta}_{1,1}(r, s)$

(c) p -values for $\hat{\beta}_{2,1}(r, s)$

Figure 4: Pointwise p -values from a two-tailed t -test on difference to zero. Dark red color indicates smaller values and the contour lines as defined in the legends indicate significance according to standard alpha levels of 0.01, 0.05 and 0.1.

p -value plot in Figure 4c, we can conclude that the variable is highly relevant for modeling electricity prices as large regions share significant p -values smaller than 0.01. The complete set of bivariate coefficient functions and their pointwise p -values can be found in Appendix A.6 and A.7. Interactive 3D surface figures and additional model visualizations, including statistical inference and goodness-of-fit analyses, are available at the supplementary website: <https://luiswn.github.io/ffr-visualizations/>.

The second part of this application chapter deals with the out-of-sample performance of our model when forecasting electricity price curves one day ahead. The relevant test set consists of two years of working days which corresponds to 520 data points. Besides the German energy data, we forecast prices on the European power market of the Nordic countries Nord Pool (NP) and the U.S. American Pennsylvania–New Jersey–Maryland (PJM) market. All three data sets are equivalent in length as they are taken from the same open-access benchmark framework provided by Lago et al. (2021)⁵.

Two non-functional benchmark models are implemented to forecast hourly spot prices. The first one is a parameter-rich LASSO estimated regression, originally suggested in the context of energy market forecasts by Uniejewski et al. (2016). The idea is to run 24 regressions for all hourly price time series on all hours of lagged-dependent and lagged-exogenous regressors. In our specific set-up, we use the same variables as in (26) but treat them as multivariate time series. That leaves the LASSO model with 220 regressors plus intercept. In theory, the regularization term deals with overfitting problems in parameter-rich models. We tune the regularization parameter for computational feasibility 4 times using 10-fold cross-validation and estimate the model with the glmnet approach by Friedman et al. (2010). The LASSO generally performs well at prediction tasks as it can process high-dimensional data efficiently compared to, for example, least squares es-

⁵The exogenous regressors of NP and PJM differ slightly from the German ones discussed above. Consult the Lago et al. (2021) paper for detailed information concerning the definitions.

Table 3: Comparison between the one day ahead rolling window electricity price forecasts of four different models (FFR, LASSO, Expert and Naive) on three different markets (DE, NP and PJM). *rMAE*, *MAE* and *RMSE* are measures for prediction accuracy.

| | | FFR | LASSO | Expert | Naive |
|-----|------|------|-------|--------|-------|
| DE | rMAE | 0.47 | 0.45 | 0.69 | 1.00 |
| | MAE | 4.20 | 4.04 | 6.17 | 8.88 |
| | RMSE | 6.46 | 6.36 | 10.11 | 14.55 |
| NP | rMAE | 0.55 | 0.48 | 0.68 | 1.00 |
| | MAE | 2.26 | 1.97 | 2.77 | 4.08 |
| | RMSE | 4.30 | 3.91 | 5.09 | 7.02 |
| PJM | rMAE | 0.71 | 0.67 | 0.72 | 1.00 |
| | MAE | 4.54 | 4.30 | 4.62 | 6.38 |
| | RMSE | 6.96 | 6.89 | 7.20 | 10.76 |

timated regressions. However, if we are not willing to put further sparsity assumptions on the data generating process, the estimator does not necessarily possess oracle properties and the coefficients are hardly interpretable (Fu and Knight, 2000; Zou, 2006). The second benchmark model is fundamentally different to the LASSO as it is based on an OLS estimated parsimonious autoregressive structure without exogenous regressors. This so-called expert model introduced by Ziel and Weron (2018) combines lagged (one day, two days, one week) prices for the same hour, last day’s minimum and maximum price, last day’s very last hourly price and all weekday dummy variables. We run this regression 24 times for all hours of the day. In case a regressor appears more than one time as it is always the case for the last hour model, the duplicate variables are removed. Estimating the expert model is computationally inexpensive and the regression coefficients are clearly interpretable. Lastly, we add a third naive forecasting method which works by always taking last weeks price at the same hour as the prediction.

Regarding performance measures, we report the mean absolute error (MAE), the MAE relative to the naive MAE (*rMAE*) and the root mean squared error (RMSE). Table 3 shows the rolling window forecast results for the three markets. The expert and the naive model yield reasonable predictions considering their simplicity, yet they underperform compared to our functional factor regression and the LASSO for all measures. The direct comparison between FFR and LASSO highlights that our model is roughly on the same level as the well established machine learning approach in terms of forecasting accuracy.

7. Conclusion

This paper introduces the functional factor regression, a novel approach for modeling time-dependent curve data that addresses limitations in existing function-on-function regression frameworks. By imposing factor structures on the regressors and assuming that the predictive information in functional variables is confined to a finite-dimensional subspace, our method is able to provide both the flexibility of infinite-dimensional functional models and the statistical inferential capabilities of traditional multiple regression.

A key challenge in conventional unrestricted functional regression is the infinite-rank regression operator, which introduces an ill-posed problem requiring nonparametric estimation. Our model addresses this by ensuring a well-posed framework, allowing for least squares estimation with parametric convergence rates. The innovation lies in assuming that a finite number of factors can effectively represent the functional regression relationship, thereby simplifying the regression operator to finite-rank. Parameters are estimated using the eigencomponents of the integral operator D , which is the product of the cross-covariance operator with its adjoint, and the required number of factors is determined through an eigenvalue-difference test. Hence, we are able to develop a novel central limit theorem for the regression parameters in a fully functional model, enabling the construction of valid confidence bands and hypothesis tests that account for the uncertainty in estimated factors and loadings.

Our empirical application to electricity price curve modeling demonstrates the practical value of our approach. The estimated bivariate slope coefficient functions reveal economically interpretable patterns while pointwise hypotheses tests make our claims statistically verifiable. Firstly, we find evidence for the existence of a pronounced end-of-day effect in lagged electricity prices. Secondly, the functional model reveals how load forecasts play only a minor role in explaining energy prices when conditioning on further regressors. The influence of wind and solar energy generation forecasts on prices, on the other hand, appears to be substantial and statistically significant. In terms of out-of-sample forecasting performance, our functional factor regression is competitive with machine learning models like LASSO.

Future research could extend this framework by addressing further econometric issues, such as endogeneity problems within the functional variables, or by exploring regression models with more complex data structures, such as volatility surfaces or climate data in the form of geographic surfaces. The accompanying R package "ffr" makes our methodology accessible to practitioners and researchers across various disciplines where functional data analysis plays an increasingly important role.

Supporting Information

An accompanying R package is available from <https://github.com/luiswn/ffr>.

A website serving as an online appendix to the application is available from <https://luiswn.github.io/ffr-visualizations/>.

References

- Ahn, S. C., & Horenstein, A. R. (2013). Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors. *Econometrica*, *81*(3), 1203–1227. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA8968>
- Aruoba, B. S. (2019). Term structures of inflation expectations and real interest rates. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, *38*(3), 542–553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07350015.2018.1529599>
- Babii, A. (2020). Honest confidence sets in nonparametric iv regression and other ill-posed models. *Econometric Theory*, *36*(4), 658–706. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266466619000380>
- Bai, J., & Ng, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*, *70*(1), 191–221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0262.00273>
- Bathia, N., Yao, Q., & Ziegelmann, F. (2010). Identifying the finite dimensionality of curve time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, *38*(6), 3352–3386. <https://doi.org/10.1214/10-AOS819>
- Bayer, C., Calderon, L., & Kuhn, M. (2025). Distributional dynamics. https://econtribute.de/RePEc/ajk/ajkdps/ECONtribute_351_2025.pdf
- Benatia, D., Carrasco, M., & Florens, J.-P. (2017). Functional linear regression with functional response. *Journal of Econometrics*, *201*(2), 269–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2017.08.008>
- Bichler, M., Buhl, H. U., & Hanny, L. (2021). Electricity spot market design 2030-2050. <https://doi.org/10.24406/FIT-N-621457>
- Billingsley, P. (1999). *Convergence of probability measures* (Second edition). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470316962>
- Bosq, D. (2000). *Linear processes in function spaces: Theory and applications* (Vol. 149). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1154-9>
- Caponera, A., & Panaretos, V. M. (2022). On the rate of convergence for the autocorrelation operator in functional autoregression. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, *189*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2022.109575>
- Cardot, H., Ferraty, F., Mas, A., & Sarda, P. (2003). Testing hypotheses in the functional linear model. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, *30*(1), 241–255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9469.00329>
- Carrasco, M., Florens, J.-P., & Renault, E. (2007). Linear inverse problems in structural econometrics estimation based on spectral decomposition and regularization. *Handbook of Econometrics*, *6*, 5633–5751. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4412\(07\)06077-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4412(07)06077-1)
- Chang, M., Chen, X., & Schorfheide, F. (2024). Heterogeneity and aggregate fluctuations. *Journal of Political Economy*, *132*(12), 4021–4067. <https://doi.org/10.1086/731411>

- Chen, Y., & Li, B. (2017). An adaptive functional autoregressive forecast model to predict electricity price curves. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, *35*(3), 371–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07350015.2015.1092976>
- Crambes, C., & Mas, A. (2013). Asymptotics of prediction in functional linear regression with functional outputs. *Bernoulli*, *19*(5B), 2627–2651. <https://doi.org/10.3150/12-BEJ469>
- Davidson, J. (2021). *Stochastic limit theory*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192844507.001.0001>
- Diebold, F. X., & Li, C. (2006). Forecasting the term structure of government bond yields. *Journal of Econometrics*, *130*(2), 337–364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2005.03.005>
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., & Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *33*(1). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v033.i01>
- Fu, W., & Knight, K. (2000). Asymptotics for lasso-type estimators. *The Annals of Statistics*, *28*(5). <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1015957397>
- Gonzalez, J. P., Roque, A. M. S., & Perez, E. A. (2018). Forecasting functional time series with a new hilbertian armax model: Application to electricity price forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, *33*(1), 545–556. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2017.2700287>
- Happ, C., & Greven, S. (2018). Multivariate functional principal component analysis for data observed on different (dimensional) domains. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *113*(522), 649–659. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2016.1273115>
- Hörmann, S., & Jammoul, F. (2023). Prediction in functional regression with discretely observed and noisy covariates. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, *178*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2022.107600>
- Hörmann, S., & Kidziński, Ł. (2014). A note on estimation in hilbertian linear models. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, *42*(1), 43–62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjos.12094>
- Horváth, L., & Kokoszka, P. (2012). *Inference for functional data with applications*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3655-3>
- Imaizumi, M., & Kato, K. (2018). Pca-based estimation for functional linear regression with functional responses. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, *163*, 15–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2017.10.001>
- Imaizumi, M., & Kato, K. (2019). A simple method to construct confidence bands in functional linear regression. *Statistica Sinica*. <https://doi.org/10.5705/ss.202017.0208>

- Inoue, A., & Rossi, B. (2021). A new approach to measuring economic policy shocks, with an application to conventional and unconventional monetary policy. *Quantitative Economics*, 12(4), 1085–1138. <https://doi.org/10.3982/QE1225>
- Kokoszka, P., & Reimherr, M. (2013). Asymptotic normality of the principal components of functional time series. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 123(5), 1546–1562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2012.12.011>
- Kokoszka, P., & Reimherr, M. (2021). *Introduction to functional data analysis*. CRC Press.
- Kutta, T., Dierickx, G., & Dette, H. (2022). Statistical inference for the slope parameter in functional linear regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 16(2), 5980–6042. <https://doi.org/10.1214/22-EJS2078>
- Lago, J., Marcjasz, G., de Schutter, B., & Weron, R. (2021). Forecasting day-ahead electricity prices: A review of state-of-the-art algorithms, best practices and an open-access benchmark. *Applied Energy*, 293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.116983>
- Lam, C., & Yao, Q. (2012). Factor modeling for high-dimensional time series: Inference for the number of factors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(2). <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS970>
- Lee, J. D., Sun, D. L., Sun, Y., & Taylor, J. E. (2016). Exact post-selection inference, with application to the lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(3). <https://doi.org/10.1214/15-AOS1371>
- Li, M., Wang, K., Maity, A., & Staicu, A.-M. (2022). Inference in functional linear quantile regression. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2022.104985>
- Li, Y., Wang, N., & Carroll, R. J. (2013). Selecting the number of principal components in functional data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(504). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2013.788980>
- Liebl, D. (2013). Modeling and forecasting electricity spot prices: A functional data perspective. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-aos652>
- Maciejowska, K., & Nowotarski, J. (2016). A hybrid model for gecom2014 probabilistic electricity price forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 32(3), 1051–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2015.11.008>
- Mas, A. (2007). Weak convergence in the functional autoregressive model. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 98(6), 1231–1261. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2006.05.010>
- Otto, S., & Salish, N. (2025). Approximate factor models for functional time series. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2201.02532>

- Ramsay, J. O., & Dalzell, C. J. (1991). Some tools for functional data analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 53(3), 539–561. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1991.tb01844.x>
- Uniejewski, B., Nowotarski, J., & Weron, R. (2016). Automated variable selection and shrinkage for day-ahead electricity price forecasting. *Energies*, 9(8), 621. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en9080621>
- White, H. (2001). *Asymptotic theory for econometricians* (Rev. ed.). Emerald.
- Wu, J. (2018). Eigenvalue difference test for the number of common factors in the approximate factor models. *Economics Letters*, 169, 63–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2018.05.009>
- Xia, Q., Xu, W., & Zhu, L. (2015). Consistently determining the number of factors in multivariate volatility modelling. *Statistica Sinica*. <https://doi.org/10.5705/ss.2013.252>
- Yao, F., Müller, H.-G., & Wang, J.-L. (2005). Functional linear regression analysis for longitudinal data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 33(6), 2873–2903. <https://doi.org/10.1214/009053605000000660>
- Zhang, R., Robinson, P., & Yao, Q. (2019). Identifying cointegration by eigenanalysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(526), 916–927. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2018.1458620>
- Ziel, F. (2016). Forecasting electricity spot prices using lasso: On capturing the autoregressive intraday structure. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 31(6), 4977–4987. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPWRS.2016.2521545>
- Ziel, F., & Weron, R. (2018). Day-ahead electricity price forecasting with high-dimensional structures: Univariate vs. multivariate modeling frameworks. *Energy Economics*, 70, 396–420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2017.12.016>
- Zou, H. (2006). The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476), 1418–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214506000000735>

A. Appendix

A.1. Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. By Assumption 3(a), the error component $\varepsilon_{jt}(s)$ has zero mean and is uncorrelated with $Y_t(r)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, and $r, s \in [a, b]$. Hence,

$$0 = E[Y_t(r)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = \int_a^b \beta_j(r, q)E[X_{jt}(q)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] dq,$$

where we substitute $Y_t(r)$ with the regression model (1), and use that $\varepsilon_{jt}(s)$ is uncorrelated with $u_t(r)$, w_t , and $\int_a^b \beta_i(r, q)X_{it}(q) dq$ for all $i \neq j$. Applying the factor structure (14) and the uncorrelatedness of $\varepsilon_{jt}(s)$ with F_t , we obtain

$$\int_a^b \beta_j(r, q)E[X_{jt}(q)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] dq = \int_a^b \beta_j(r, q)E[\varepsilon_{jt}(q)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] dq.$$

Therefore,

$$E[Y_t(r)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = \int_a^b \beta_j(r, q)E[\varepsilon_{jt}(q)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] dq = 0. \quad (27)$$

Let $\kappa_{1j} \geq \kappa_{2j} \geq \dots$ be the sequence of positive eigenvalues of the covariance operator of ε_{jt} , and let v_{1j}, v_{2j}, \dots be a sequence of corresponding eigenfunctions, i.e., the functional principal components of ε_{jt} . The Karhunen-Loève expansion and Mercer's theorem yield

$$\varepsilon_{jt}(s) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \langle \varepsilon_{jt}, v_{mj} \rangle v_{mj}(s), \quad E[\varepsilon_{jt}(r)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{mj} v_{mj}(r)v_{mj}(s).$$

By substituting this into (27), we get

$$E[Y_t(r)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \kappa_{mj} v_{mj}(s) \int_a^b \beta_j(r, q) v_{mj}(q) dq = 0,$$

and, for any fixed l ,

$$\int_a^b E[Y_t(r)\varepsilon_{jt}(s)] v_{lj}(s) ds = \kappa_{lj} \int_a^b \beta_j(r, q) v_{lj}(q) dq = 0.$$

Since $\kappa_{lj} > 0$ for all l , it follows that

$$\int_a^b \beta_j(r, q) v_{lj}(q) dq = 0 \quad \text{for all } l, \quad (28)$$

which implies that ε_{jt} lies in the null space of the regression operator mapping $h(r)$ onto $\int_a^b \beta_j(r, s)h(s) ds$. Finally, by Assumption 2, $\beta_j(r, \cdot) \in \overline{Im(\Gamma_j)}$, and we know that

$$\overline{Im(\Gamma_j)} = \text{span}(\psi_{1j}, \dots, \psi_{K_j j}, v_{1j}, v_{2j}, \dots)$$

by the factor structure (14). Since $\beta_j(r, \cdot)$ is not in the span of $\{v_{1j}, v_{2j}, \dots\}$ by (28), it must lie in the span of $\{\psi_{1j}, \dots, \psi_{K_j j}\}$ alone. Hence, we have

$$\beta_j(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \beta_{lj}(r) \psi_{lj}(s) = (B_j(r))' \Psi_j(s)$$

where $\beta_{lj}(r) = \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) \psi_{lj}(s) ds$ and $B_j(r) = (\beta_{1j}(r), \dots, \beta_{K_j j}(r))'$. □

A.2. Proof of Theorem 1

All elements in Theorem 1 follow by the sum of Lemma 2–7.

Lemma 2. *Let V_t be a $L^2([a, b])$ -valued random process with $\mu(r) = E[V_t(r)]$. Furthermore, $\sup_t E[(V_t(r))^\nu] < \infty$ for some $\nu > 2$ such that V_t is α -mixing of size $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$. Let $\hat{\mu}(r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T V_t(r)$. Then,*

$$\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| = O_P(T^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. Note that V_t is α -mixing of size $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$ if the α -mixing sequence α_h of V_t satisfies $\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \alpha_h^{(\nu-2)/\nu} < \infty$ (see, e.g., Davidson, 2021, Section 15.1). Functions of α -mixing processes are α -mixing of the same size, which implies that $V_t(r)$ is α -mixing for any $r \in [a, b]$. The mixing inequality for α -mixing processes (see, e.g., Corollary 15.3 in Davidson, 2021) implies

$$|Cov(V_t(r), V_{t-h}(r))| \leq 6\alpha_h^{(p-2)/p} (E[(V_t(r))^p] E[(V_{t-h}(r))^p])^{1/p} \quad (29)$$

for any $p \geq 2$. We can decompose

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\mu}(r) - \mu(r))^2 &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T V_t(r) - \mu(r) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T (V_t(r) - \mu(r))^2 + \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} (V_t(r) - \mu(r))(V_{t-h}(r) - \mu(r)) \end{aligned}$$

and obtain

$$E[\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2] = \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \int_a^b Var[V_t(r)] dr + \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \int_a^b Cov(V_t(r), V_{t-h}(r)) dr.$$

The first term is $O(T^{-1})$ since $\nu \geq 2$, and, with the mixing inequality with $p = \nu$, the second term satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \int_a^b \text{Cov}(V_t(r), V_{t-h}(r)) \, dr \right| \\ & \leq \frac{12}{T^2} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \alpha_h^{(\nu-2)/\nu} \int_a^b (E[(V_t(r))^\nu] E[(V_{t-h}(r))^\nu])^{1/\nu} \, dr, \end{aligned}$$

which is $O(T^{-1})$ as well since $\sum_{h=1}^\infty \alpha_h^{(\nu-2)/\nu} < \infty$ and the fact that the ν -th moments are bounded. The assertion follows by Markov's inequality. \square

Lemma 3. *Let V_t and P_t be $L^2([a, b])$ -valued random processes with $\mu_V(r) = E[V_t(r)]$, $\mu_P(r) = E[P_t(r)]$, and $\sigma(r, s) = \text{Cov}(V_t(r), P_t(s))$. Furthermore, $\sup_t E[(V_t(r))^\nu] < \infty$ and $\sup_t E[(P_t(r))^\nu] < \infty$ for some $\nu \geq 4$ such that the joint process (V_t, P_t) is α -mixing of size $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$. Let $\hat{\mu}_V(r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T V_t(r)$, $\hat{\mu}_P(r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T P_t(r)$, and $\hat{\sigma}(r, s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (V_t(r) - \hat{\mu}_V(r))(P_t(s) - \hat{\mu}_P(s))$. If $V_t = P_t$, S is the covariance operator and \hat{S} is the sample covariance operator. If $V_t \neq P_t$, S is the cross covariance operator and \hat{S} is the sample cross covariance operator. Then,*

$$\|\hat{S} - S\|_S = O_P(T^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. Let \tilde{S} be the integral operator with kernel $\tilde{\sigma}(r, s) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (V_t(r) - \mu_V(r))(P_t(s) - \mu_P(s))$. We can decompose

$$\hat{\sigma}(r, s) = \tilde{\sigma}(r, s) - (\mu_V(r) - \hat{\mu}_V(r))(\mu_P(s) - \hat{\mu}_P(s)),$$

which implies that $\|\hat{S} - \tilde{S}\|_S = \|\mu_V - \hat{\mu}_V\| \|\mu_P - \hat{\mu}_P\| = O_P(T^{-1})$ by the Lemma 2. By the triangle inequality, it remains to show that $\|\tilde{S} - S\|_S = O_P(T^{-1/2})$. Let us define the centered random variables $V_t^*(r) := V_t(r) - \mu_V(r)$ and $P_t^*(r) := P_t(r) - \mu_P(r)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\sigma}(r, s) - \sigma(r, s))^2 &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T V_t^*(r) P_t^*(s) - E[V_t^*(r) P_t^*(s)] \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T (V_t^*(r) P_t^*(s) - E[V_t^*(r) P_t^*(s)])^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} (V_t^*(r) P_t^*(s) - E[V_t^*(r) P_t^*(s)])(V_{t-h}^*(r) P_{t-h}^*(s) - E[V_{t-h}^*(r) P_{t-h}^*(s)]), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|\tilde{S} - S\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2] &= \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \int_a^b \int_a^b \text{Var}[V_t^*(r)P_t^*(s)] \, dr \, ds \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \int_a^b \int_a^b \text{Cov}(V_t^*(r)P_t^*(s), V_{t-h}^*(r)P_{t-h}^*(s)) \, dr \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is $O(T^{-1})$ since $\text{Var}[V_t^*(r)P_t^*(s)] < \infty$. This follows from the Cauchy Schwarz inequality and the fact that we have bounded fourth moments. For the second term, we apply the mixing inequality from equation (29) with $p = \nu$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \int_a^b \int_a^b \text{Cov}(V_t^*(r)P_t^*(s), V_{t-h}^*(r)P_{t-h}^*(s)) \, dr \, ds \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2}{T^2} \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \alpha_h^{(\nu-2)/\nu} \int_a^b \int_a^b (E[(V_t^*(r)P_t^*(s))^\nu] E[(V_{t-h}^*(r)P_{t-h}^*(s))^\nu])^{1/\nu} \, dr \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\int_a^b \int_a^b (E[(V_t^*(r)P_t^*(s))^\nu] E[(V_{t-h}^*(r)P_{t-h}^*(s))^\nu])^{1/\nu} \, dr \, ds < \infty$ by the Cauchy Schwarz inequality and the fact that ν -th moments are bounded, and $\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \alpha_h^{(\nu-2)/\nu} < \infty$ by the α -mixing property, which implies that the second term of $E[\|\tilde{S} - S\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2]$ is $O(T^{-1})$ as well. The assertion follows by Markov's inequality. \square

Lemma 4. Let Y_t and X_{jt} be defined as in equation (1) and (14). C_j is the auxiliary cross covariance integral operator with kernel $c_j(r, s) := \text{Cov}[X_{jt}(r), Y_t(s)]$. The respective sample counterparts \hat{C}_j and $\hat{c}_j(r, s)$ are defined as in equation (19). By Assumption 4, for any $j = 1, \dots, J$,

$$\left\| \hat{C}_j - C_j \right\|_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$$

Proof. Because functions of α -mixing processes are α -mixing of the same size, $Y_t(r)$ is α -mixing for any $r \in [a, b]$ by Assumption 4. Hence, the assertion follows by Lemma 3. \square

Lemma 5. Let D_j and \hat{D}_j be the respective integral operators of the kernels d_j and \hat{d}_j as defined in equations (13) and (20). By Assumptions 1-4, for any $j = 1, \dots, J$,

$$\left\| \hat{D}_j - D_j \right\|_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2})$$

Proof. Consider the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_a^b \hat{c}_j(r, q) \hat{c}_j(q, s) - c_j(r, q) c_j(q, s) \, dq \\ &= \int_a^b (\hat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q)) \hat{c}_j(q, s) + (\hat{c}_j(s, q) - c_j(s, q)) c_j(q, r) \, dq \\ &= a_3(r, s) + a_4(r, s) + a_5(r, s), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_3(r, s) &= \int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q)) (\widehat{c}_j(s, q) - c_j(s, q)) dq, \\ a_4(r, s) &= \int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q)) c_j(q, s) dq, \\ a_5(r, s) &= \int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(s, q) - c_j(s, q)) c_j(q, r) dq. \end{aligned}$$

The triangle inequality states that $\|\widehat{D} - D\|_{\mathcal{S}} \leq \|A_3\|_{\mathcal{S}} + \|A_4\|_{\mathcal{S}} + \|A_5\|_{\mathcal{S}}$. Starting with the first term,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_3\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 &= \int_a^b \int_a^b a_3(r, s)^2 dr ds \\ &= \int_a^b \int_a^b \left(\int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q)) (\widehat{c}_j(s, q) - c_j(s, q)) dq \right)^2 dr ds \\ &\leq \int_a^b \int_a^b \left(\int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q))^2 dq \int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(s, q) - c_j(s, q))^2 dq \right) dr ds \\ &= \int_a^b \int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q))^2 dq dr \int_a^b \int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(s, q) - c_j(s, q))^2 dq ds \\ &= \left\| \widehat{C}_j - C_j \right\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 \left\| \widehat{C}_j - C_j \right\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 4. Moving on to the second term,

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_4\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 &= \int_a^b \int_a^b a_4(r, s)^2 dr ds \\ &= \int_a^b \int_a^b \left(\int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q)) c_j(q, s) dq \right)^2 dr ds \\ &\leq \int_a^b \int_a^b \left(\int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q))^2 dq \int_a^b c_j(q, s)^2 dq \right) dr ds \\ &= \int_a^b \int_a^b (\widehat{c}_j(r, q) - c_j(r, q))^2 dq dr \int_a^b \int_a^b c_j(q, s)^2 dq ds \\ &= \left\| \widehat{C}_j - C_j \right\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 \|C_j\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the term $\|A_1\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2$, the auxiliary covariance function is continuous and defined on a closed bounded interval. Therefore, the boundedness theorem states that there exists a positive real constant such that $\sup_{s, q \in [0, 1]} |c_j(s, q)| = K < \infty$. In combination with Lemma 4, the last equality holds.

Because $\|A_4\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 = \|A_5\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2$, the proof follows analogously and we conclude that $\|\widehat{D} - D\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1})$. \square

Lemma 6. *The eigenvalues λ_{lj} of the operator D_j can be estimated by their empirical counterparts $\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}$ of \widehat{D}_j . For each $l \geq 1$ and any $j = 1, \dots, J$,*

$$\left| \widehat{\lambda}_{lj} - \lambda_{lj} \right| = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. Lemma 2.2 in Horváth and Kokoszka (2012) implies that

$$\left| \widehat{\lambda}_{lj} - \lambda_{lj} \right| \leq \left\| \widehat{D}_j - D_j \right\|_{\mathcal{S}},$$

for each $l \geq 1$. The assertion then results as a consequence of Lemma 5. \square

Lemma 7. *The eigenfunctions $\psi_{lj}(s)$ of the operator D_j can be estimated by their empirical counterparts $\widehat{\psi}_{lj}(s)$ of \widehat{D}_j . For any $j = 1, \dots, J$,*

$$\max_{1 \leq l \leq K_j} \left\| s_{lj} \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - \psi_{lj} \right\| = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}).$$

Proof. Lemma 2.3 in Horváth and Kokoszka (2012) implies that

$$\max_{1 \leq l \leq K_j} \left\| s_{lj} \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - \psi_{lj} \right\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\alpha} \left\| \widehat{D}_j - D_j \right\|_{\mathcal{S}},$$

where $\alpha = \min \{ \lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \lambda_2 - \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_{K_j-1} - \lambda_{K_j}, \lambda_{K_j} \}$. The assertion then results as a consequence of Lemma 5. \square

A.3. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Define $c := \sqrt{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \|X_{jt} - \bar{X}_j\|^2} \sqrt{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \|Y_t - \bar{Y}\|^2}$, where $c = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$. Then for $1 \leq l \leq K_j$ and any $j = 1, \dots, J$,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \gamma \ln(T) \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}}{c} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \gamma \ln(T) \left(\frac{\lambda_{lj}}{c} + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) \right) = \infty,$$

because $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \ln(T) \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) = 0$ and $\lambda_{lj}/c > 0$ by Theorem 1, Assumption 3(b) and $c > 0$. Then

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \arctan(\gamma \ln(T) \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}}{c}) = \frac{\pi}{2},$$

leading to

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} G(\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\pi}{2} = 1.$$

For $K_j + 1 \leq l \leq K_j^{\max}$ and any $j = 1, \dots, J$,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \gamma \ln(T) \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}}{c} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \gamma \ln(T) \left(\frac{\lambda_{lj}}{c} + \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) \right) = 0,$$

because $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \ln(T) \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1/2}) = 0$ and $\lambda_{lj}/c = 0$ by Theorem 1, Assumption 3(b) and $c > 0$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} G(\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}) = 0.$$

As defined in section 4.2,

$$g_{lj} := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } l = 0 \\ G(\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}), & \text{for } l = 1, \dots, K_j^{\max} \\ 0, & \text{for } l = K_j^{\max} + 1. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\widehat{K}_j^{ED} = \arg \max_{0 \leq l \leq K_j^{\max}} \{g_{lj} - g_{(l+1)j}\}$ then implies

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\widehat{K}_j^{ED} = K_j) = 1.$$

□

A.4. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. A challenge for the notation of this proof is that the signs of the loadings $\psi_{lj}(s)$ and the coefficients $\beta_{jt}(r) = \int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) \psi_{lj}(s) ds$ are unidentified whereas the signs of their products $\beta_{lj}(r) \psi_{lj}(s)$ and of the true coefficient function $\beta_j(r, s) = \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \beta_{lj}(r) \psi_{lj}(s)$ are identified.

Therefore, we condition our notation on the selected signs of the estimated loadings and define the sign matrices $S_j = \text{diag}(s_{1j}, \dots, s_{K_j j})$ and $S = \text{diag}(I_N, S_1, \dots, S_J)$ with $s_{lj} = \text{sign}(\langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj}, \psi_{lj} \rangle)$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$ and $l = 1, \dots, K_j$. This matrix has the property that $S = S'$ and $SS = I_M$, where $M = N + \sum_{j=1}^J K_j$.

To represent the j -th coefficient surface and its estimator conveniently, let $P_j \in \mathbb{R}^{K_j \times M}$ be the selection matrix defined by

$$(P_j)_{k,i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = N + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} K_l + k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

to extract the relevant entries of $B(r)$ and $\widehat{B}(r)$. Then, $P_j B(r) = B_j(r)$, $P_j \widehat{B}(r) = \widehat{B}_j(r)$, and $P_j \widehat{Q}^{-1} = [\widehat{Q}^{-1}]_j$. The selection matrix has the property $SP_j' = P_j' S_j$. Then, the coefficient functions are

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_j(r, s) &= (B_j(r))' \Psi_j(s) = (SB(r))' P_j' S_j \Psi_j(s), \\ \widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) &= (\widehat{B}_j(r))' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) = (\widehat{B}(r))' P_j' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) - \beta_j(r, s) = (\widehat{B}(r) - SB(r))' P_j' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) + (SB(r))' P_j' (\widehat{\Psi}_j(s) - S_j \Psi_j(s)).$$

The least squares estimator is defined as

$$\widehat{B}(r) = \widehat{Q}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t Y_t(r) \right), \quad \widehat{Q} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \widehat{z}_t',$$

which gives

$$\sqrt{T}(\widehat{B}(r) - SB(r)) = \widehat{Q}^{-1} \widetilde{A}(r), \quad \widetilde{A}(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t (Y_t(r) - \widehat{z}_t' SB(r)). \quad (30)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T}(\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) - \beta_j(r, s)) &= \sqrt{T}(\widehat{B}(r) - SB(r))' P_j' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) + \sqrt{T}(SB(r))' P_j' (\widehat{\Psi}_j(s) - S_j \Psi_j(s)) \\ &= (P_j \widehat{Q}^{-1} \widetilde{A}(r))' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) + \sqrt{T}(\widehat{\Psi}_j(s) - S_j \Psi_j(s))' S_j B_j(r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 24 and the consistency of $\widehat{\Psi}_j(s)$ by Theorem 1 imply

$$(P_j \widehat{Q}^{-1} \widetilde{A}(r))' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left((P_j Q^{-1} z_t^* u_t(r))' \Psi_j(s) + \omega_{jt}^{(B)}(r, s) \right) + o_P(1), \quad (31)$$

where $z_t^* = (w_t', F_{1t}^*, \dots, F_{Jt}^*)'$ with $F_{lt}^* = (f_{1jt}^*, \dots, f_{K_{jt}t}^*)'$, $f_{ljt}^* = \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \psi_{lj} \rangle$, and $Q = E[z_t^* (z_t^*)']$. Note that $z_t^* = z_t + e_t$ with $e_t = (\langle \varepsilon_{jt}, \psi_{1j} \rangle, \dots, \langle \varepsilon_{jt}, \psi_{K_{jj}} \rangle)'$ and $Q = E[z_t z_t'] + E[e_t e_t']$. Because $E[z_t z_t']$ is positive definite by Assumption 3(c), Q must be positive definite as well, and Q^{-1} exists. The additional term in the expression above is

$$\omega_{jt}^{(B)}(r, s) = (\Psi_j(s))' P_j Q^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^J \left(E[z_t^* (F_{kt}^*)'] - E[z_t^* (F_{kt}^*)'] G_{kt} \right) B_k(r),$$

where G_{kt} is the $K_j \times K_j$ matrix with the (l, m) -entries

$$[G_{kt}]_{lm} = (\lambda_{lk} - \lambda_{mk})^{-1} (f_{mkt}^* y_{lkt} - E[f_{mkt}^* y_{lkt}] + f_{lkt}^* y_{mkt} - E[f_{lkt}^* y_{mkt}]) 1_{\{l \neq m\}}. \quad (32)$$

Lemma 29 implies

$$\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\Psi}_j(s) - S_j \Psi_j(s))' S_j B_j(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_{jt}^{(\Psi)}(r, s) + o_P(1), \quad (33)$$

where

$$\omega_{jt}^{(\Psi)}(r, s) = (\Psi_j(s))' G_{jt} B_j(r) + \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) h'_{jt} B_j(r)$$

with $\varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) = X_{jt}(s) - \mu_j(s) - (F_{jt}^*)' \Psi_j(s)$, and h_{jt} is the vector of length K_j with entries $h_{ljt} = \lambda_{lj}^{-1} \langle \gamma_{lj}, Y_t - E[Y_t] \rangle$, where $\gamma_{lj}(r) = E[f_{ljt}^*(Y_t(r) - E[Y_t(r)])]$. Therefore,

$$\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) - \beta_j(r, s)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left((z_t^* u_t(r))' \Psi_j(s) + \omega_{jt}^{(B)}(r, s) + \omega_{jt}^{(\Psi)}(r, s) \right) + o_P(1).$$

Note that $(z_t^* u_t(r))' \Psi_j(s) + \omega_{jt}^{(B)}(r, s) + \omega_{jt}^{(\Psi)}(r, s)$ is a zero mean and alpha mixing sequence of size $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$. Therefore, by the central limit theorem for alpha-mixing sequences (e.g., Theorem 5.20 in White, 2001), we have

$$\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) - \beta_j(r, s)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega_j(r, s)) \quad (34)$$

for any fixed $r, s \in [a, b]$, where $\Omega_j(r, s) = \text{Var}[(z_t^* u_t(r))' \Psi_j(s) + \omega_{jt}^{(B)}(r, s) + \omega_{jt}^{(\Psi)}(r, s)]$. To show that $\widehat{\Omega}_j(r, s)$ is a consistent estimator for $\Omega_j(r, s)$, we apply Lemmas 25 and 30, which give

$$\begin{aligned} & (P_j \widehat{Q}^{-1} \widetilde{A}(r))' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) + \sqrt{T}(\widehat{\Psi}_j(s) - S_j \Psi_j(s))' S_j B_j(r) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left((P_j \widehat{Q}^{-1} \widehat{z}_t \widehat{u}_t(r))' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) + \widehat{\omega}_{jt}(r, s) \right) + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (31) and (33),

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(([\widehat{Q}^{-1}]_j \widehat{z}_t \widehat{u}_t(r))' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) + \widehat{\omega}_{jt}(r, s) \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left((P_j Q^{-1} z_t^* u_t(r))' \Psi_j(s) + \omega_{jt}^{(B)}(r, s) + \omega_{jt}^{(\Psi)}(r, s) \right) = o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Omega}_j(r, s) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(([\widehat{Q}^{-1}]_j \widehat{z}_t \widehat{u}_t(r))' \widehat{\Psi}_j(s) + \widehat{\omega}_{jt}(r, s) \right)^2 \\ &\xrightarrow{P} E \left[\left((z_t^* u_t(r))' \Psi_j(s) + \omega_{jt}^{(B)}(r, s) + \omega_{jt}^{(\Psi)}(r, s) \right)^2 \right] = \Omega_j(r, s) \end{aligned}$$

by the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing processes (e.g., Theorem 3.47 in White, 2001). Therefore, by (34) and Slutsky's theorem,

$$\frac{\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) - \beta_j(r, s))}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Omega}_j(r, s)}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \text{pointwise for } r, s \in [a, b]. \quad (35)$$

To show that (35) also holds uniformly in $r, s \in [a, b]$ in the space of continuous functions $\mathcal{C}[a, b] \times \mathcal{C}[a, b]$ equipped with the sup-norm, we employ Theorem 7.5 in Billingsley (1999), which requires that two conditions must be satisfied. First, finite-dimensional convergence of (35) holds because, by the Cramer-Wold device and the central limit theorem for alpha-mixing sequences, the vector

$$\left(\frac{\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\beta}_j(r_1, s_1) - \beta_j(r_1, s_1))}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Omega}_j(r_1, s_1)}}, \dots, \frac{\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\beta}_j(r_k, s_k) - \beta_j(r_k, s_k))}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Omega}_j(r_k, s_k)}} \right)$$

converges to a Gaussian vector for any $r_1, \dots, r_k \in [a, b]$ and $s_1, \dots, s_k \in [a, b]$. The second condition is asymptotic uniform stochastic equicontinuity of the left-hand side of (35). This follows from Assumption 4(b). Since $Y_t(r)$ and $X_{jt}(s)$ have differentiable sample paths, and $B(r)$ and $\Psi_j(s)$ are differentiable,

$$\frac{\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\beta}_j(r, s) - \beta_j(r, s))}{\sqrt{\widehat{\Omega}_j(r, s)}}$$

also has differentiable and hence Lipschitz-continuous sample paths, and the sufficient condition for asymptotic uniform stochastic equicontinuity stated in Theorem 22.10 in Davidson (2021) is fulfilled. Hence (35) holds uniformly in the space $\mathcal{C}[a, b] \times \mathcal{C}[a, b]$. \square

A.4.1. Auxiliary Lemmas for the proof of Theorem 3

In this subsection we present some auxiliary lemmas required for the proof of Theorem 3. Throughout the proofs of these lemmas, we will use the following definitions and useful facts:

1. For all real numbers c_1, c_2 we have $(c_1 + c_2)^2 \leq 2(c_1^2 + c_2^2)$
2. The Euclidean vector norm for a $n \times 1$ vector a is $\|a\|_2 = (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2)^{1/2}$. The Frobenius matrix norm for a $n \times k$ matrix A is $\|A\|_F = (\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k A_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$. We have $\|ab'\|_F \leq \|a\|_2 \|b\|_2$, and, by the triangle and Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T a_t b_t' \right\|_F \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|a_t\|_2 \|b_t\|_2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|a_t\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|b_t\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Furthermore, $\|Aa\|_2 \leq \|A\|_F \|a\|_2$ and $|a'b| \leq \|a\|_2 \|b\|_2$.

3. The Hilbert-Schmidt norm and the L^2 -norm are compatible, i.e., for an operator \mathcal{T} and a function x we have $\|\mathcal{T}x\| \leq \|\mathcal{T}\|_S \|x\|$. Furthermore, $\langle \mathcal{T}(x), y \rangle = \langle x, \mathcal{T}^*(y) \rangle$ for all $x, y \in H$, where \mathcal{T}^* is the adjoint operator.
4. Define $z_t^* = (w_t', (F_{1t}^*)', \dots, (F_{Jt}^*)')'$ with $F_{jt}^* = (f_{1jt}^*, \dots, f_{K_j jt}^*)'$ and $f_{ljt}^* = \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \psi_{lj} \rangle$. Define the sign matrices $S_j = \text{diag}(s_{1j}, \dots, s_{K_j j})$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$ with $s_{lj} = \text{sign}(\langle \hat{\psi}_{lj}, \psi_{lj} \rangle)$ for $l = 1, \dots, K_j$, and $S = \text{diag}(I_N, S_1, \dots, S_J)$ with the property $S = S' = S^{-1}$. Furthermore, define $\varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) = X_{jt}(s) - \mu_j(s) - (F_{jt}^*)' \Psi_j(s)$, $Q = E[z_t^* (z_t^*)']$, $Q^* = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^* (z_t^*)'$, $y_{ljt} = \langle Y_t - E[Y_t], \psi_{lj} \rangle$, $g_{lmjt} = s_{mj} s_{lj} ((f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt} - E[f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt}]) + (f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt} - E[f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt}]))$, $\hat{g}_{lmjt} = \hat{f}_{mjt} \hat{y}_{ljt} - \overline{f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt}} + \hat{f}_{ljt} \hat{y}_{mjt} - \overline{f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt}}$, and $\gamma_{lj}(r) = E[f_{ljt}^* (Y_t(r) - E[Y_t(r)])]$.
5. We will frequently use the facts that all random variables have bounded fourth moments by Assumption 4(a) and that the primitives are \sqrt{T} -consistent by Theorem 1. Further, we frequently apply the Cauchy-Schwarz and triangle inequalities.
6. We will frequently use the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing sequences (Theorem 3.47 in White, 2001) and the central limit theorem for alpha mixing sequences (Theorem 5.20 in White, 2001).
7. All results in this subsection follow under Assumptions 1–4, for any $j = 1, \dots, J$, $l = 1, \dots, K_j$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $r, s \in [a, b]$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 8. $\|\hat{z}_t - Sz_t^*\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Proof. By Cauchy-Schwarz, the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives, and bounded fourth moments,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{z}_t - Sz_t^*\|_2^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \left(\langle X_{jt} - \hat{\mu}_j, \hat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle - \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \left(\langle \mu_j - \hat{\mu}_j, \hat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle + \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \hat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \|\mu_j - \hat{\mu}_j\|^2 + \|X_{jt} - \mu_j\|^2 \|\hat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}\|^2 = O_P(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 9. $\|\hat{Q} - SQ^*S\|_F = O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Proof. By the triangle inequality, the relation of Frobenius and Euclidean norm, Lemma 8, and bounded fourth moments,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\widehat{Q} - SQ^*S\|_F \\
&= \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \widehat{z}_t' - (Sz_t^*)(Sz_t^*)' \right\|_F \\
&= \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\widehat{z}_t - Sz_t^*)' \widehat{z}_t' + (Sz_t^*)(\widehat{z}_t - Sz_t^*)' \right\|_F \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\widehat{z}_t - Sz_t^*)' \widehat{z}_t' \right\|_F + \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (Sz_t^*)(\widehat{z}_t - Sz_t^*)' \right\|_F \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\widehat{z}_t - Sz_t^*\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\widehat{z}_t\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|z_t^*\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\widehat{z}_t - Sz_t^*\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&= O_P(T^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 10. $\|Q^* - Q\|_F = o_P(1)$.

Proof. Since z_t^* alpha-mixing of size $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$, the result follows from the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing sequences. □

Lemma 11. $\|\widehat{Q} - SQS\|_F = o_P(1)$ and $\|\widehat{Q}^{-1} - SQ^{-1}S\|_F = o_P(1)$.

Proof. Follows by Lemmas 9–10, the triangle inequality, the fact that $S = S^{-1}$ and the continuous mapping theorem. □

Lemma 12. $\|\widehat{B}(r) - SB(r)\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Proof. Since $\beta_j(r) = (B_j(r))' \Psi_j(s)$, we have $\int_a^b \beta_j(r, s) X_{jt}(s) ds = (B_j(r))' F_{jt}^*$ and the regression equation can be represented as $Y_t(r) = (Sz_t^*)' SB(r) + u_t(r)$. Therefore,

$$\widehat{Q} \widehat{B}(r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t Y_t(r) = \widehat{Q} SB(r) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t (Sz_t^* - \widehat{z}_t)' SB(r) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t u_t(r)$$

and

$$\widehat{Q}^{-1}(\widehat{B}(r) - SB(r)) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t (Sz_t^* - \widehat{z}_t)' SB(r) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (Sz_t^* - \widehat{z}_t) u_t(r) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T Sz_t^* u_t(r).$$

By Lemma 8 and bounded fourth moments,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t (S z_t^* - \widehat{z}_t)' S B(r) \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\widehat{z}_t\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|S z_t^* - \widehat{z}_t\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \|B(r)\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (S z_t^* - \widehat{z}_t) u_t(r) \right\|_2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|S z_t^* - \widehat{z}_t\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |u_t(r)|^2 \right)^{1/2} = O_P(T^{-1/2}).$$

The result follows from Lemma 11 and

$$\left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T S z_t^* u_t(r) \right\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

which holds because $z_t^* u_t(r)$ is a zero mean martingale difference sequence for all $r \in [a, b]$ by Assumption 1. \square

Lemma 13. $\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T (\widehat{z}_t - S z_t^*) u_t(r) \right\|_2 = O_P(1)$.

Proof. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 8,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T (\widehat{z}_t - S z_t^*) u_t(r) \right\|_2^2 \\ & = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\langle \mu_j - \widehat{\mu}_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle + \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle \right) u_t(r) \right)^2 \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \langle \mu_j - \widehat{\mu}_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle u_t(r) \right)^2 + \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle u_t(r) \right)^2 \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \|\mu_j - \widehat{\mu}_j\|^2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^T u_t(r) \right)^2 + \|\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}\|^2 \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T (X_{jt} - \mu_j) u_t(r) \right\|^2 = O_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

by the consistency of the primitives, bounded fourth moments, Cauchy-Schwarz, and because $u_t(r)$ and $(X_{jt}(s) - \mu_j(s)) u_t(r)$ are zero mean martingale difference sequences for all $r, s \in [a, b]$ by Assumption 1. \square

Lemma 14. $\langle \widehat{\mu}_j - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{lj} f_{ljt}^* + O_P(T^{-1})$.

Proof. We have $\langle \widehat{\mu}_j - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle$ and $f_{ljt}^* = \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \psi_{lj} \rangle$, which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{\mu}_j - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{lj} f_{ljt}^* &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle \\ &= \left\langle \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (X_{jt} - \mu_j), \psi_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \right\rangle \\ &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (X_{jt} - \mu_j) \right\| \|\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}\|, \end{aligned}$$

because $\|\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}\| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$ and $\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T (X_{jt} - \mu_j)\| = O_P(1)$ by the central limit theorem for alpha-mixing sequences. \square

Lemma 15. $\langle s_{lj} \psi_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle = O_P(T^{-1})$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &2\langle s_{lj} \psi_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle + \|\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}\|^2 \\ &= \langle 2s_{lj} \psi_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle + \langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle \\ &= \langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj} + s_{lj} \psi_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle \\ &= \langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle - \langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj}, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle + \langle s_{lj} \psi_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle - \langle s_{lj} \psi_{lj}, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by the orthonormality of the eigenfunctions. Therefore,

$$2\langle s_{lj} \psi_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle = -\|\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}\|^2 = O_P(T^{-1})$$

by the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives. This trick is inspired by the approach in Kokoszka and Reimherr (2013). \square

Lemma 16.

$$\langle \psi_{mj}, (\widehat{D}_j - D_j)(\psi_{lj}) \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left((f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt} - E[f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt}]) + (f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt} - E[f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt}]) \right) + O_P(T^{-1}).$$

Proof. We have $\widehat{D}_j = \widehat{C}_j \widehat{C}_j^*$ and $D_j = C_j C_j^*$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{D}_j - D_j &= (\widehat{C}_j - C_j)(\widehat{C}_j^* - C_j^*) + (\widehat{C}_j - C_j)C_j^* + C_j(\widehat{C}_j^* - C_j^*) \\ &= (\widehat{C}_j - C_j)C_j^* + C_j(\widehat{C}_j^* - C_j^*) + O_P(T^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

because $\|(\widehat{C}_j - C_j)(\widehat{C}_j^* - C_j^*)\|_{\mathcal{S}} \leq \|\widehat{C}_j - C_j\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 = O_P(T^{-1})$. Furthermore, let \widetilde{C}_j be the sample cross-covariance operator with true mean, which is the integral operator with the kernel function $\widetilde{c}_j(r, s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (X_{jt}(r) - \mu_j(r))(Y_t(s) - E[Y_t(s)])$. Then,

$$\widehat{c}_j(r, s) - \widetilde{c}_j(r, s) = (\widehat{\mu}_j(r) - \mu_j(r))(E[Y_t(s)] - \bar{Y}(s)),$$

and $\|\widehat{C}_j - \widetilde{C}_j\|_{\mathcal{S}} = O_P(T^{-1})$ by the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives, which implies

$$\widehat{D}_j - D_j = (\widetilde{C}_j - C_j)C_j^* + C_j(\widetilde{C}_j^* - C_j^*) + O_P(T^{-1}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_{mj}, (\widehat{D}_j - D_j)(\psi_{lj}) \rangle &= \langle \psi_{mj}, (\widetilde{C}_j - C_j)C_j^*(\psi_{lj}) \rangle + \langle \psi_{mj}, C_j(\widetilde{C}_j^* - C_j^*)(\psi_{lj}) \rangle + O_P(T^{-1}) \\ &= \langle (\widetilde{C}_j^* - C_j^*)(\psi_{mj}), C_j^*(\psi_{lj}) \rangle + \langle C_j^*(\psi_{mj}), (\widetilde{C}_j^* - C_j^*)(\psi_{lj}) \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi_{mj}, (\widetilde{C}_j - C_j)(\gamma_{lj}) \rangle + \langle \psi_{lj}, (\widetilde{C}_j - C_j)(\gamma_{mj}) \rangle + O_P(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows with $\gamma_{lj}(q) = E[f_{ljt}^* Y_t(q)]$ because $\psi_{1j}, \dots, \psi_{K_jj}$ are the left-singular functions of C_j with $c_j(r, s) = (\Psi_j(s))' E[F_{jt}^* Y_t(r)]$ and $C_j^*(\psi_{lj})(q) = E[f_{ljt}^* Y_t(q)]$. The kernel function of the integral operator $\widetilde{C}_j - C_j$ is

$$\widetilde{c}_j(r, s) - c_j(r, s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T w_{jt}(r, s)$$

with

$$w_{jt}(r, s) = (X_{jt}(r) - \mu_j(r))(Y_t(s) - E[Y_t(s)]) - E[(X_{jt}(r) - \mu_j(r))(Y_t(s) - E[Y_t(s)])].$$

Therefore, with $f_{mjt}^* = \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \psi_{mj} \rangle$ and $y_{ljt} = \langle Y_t - E[Y_t], \psi_{lj} \rangle$,

$$\langle \psi_{mj}, (\widetilde{C}_j - C_j)(\gamma_{lj}) \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt} - E[f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt}] \right),$$

and the result follows. □

Lemma 17. For $m \neq l$,

$$\langle s_{mj} \psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{g_{lmjt}}{\lambda_{lj} - \lambda_{mj}} + O_P(T^{-1}).$$

Proof. The eigenpair $(\lambda_{mj}, \psi_{mj})$ is defined through the equation $D_j(\psi_{mj})(r) = \lambda_{mj}\psi_{mj}(r)$, where the operator D_j is symmetric with the property that $\langle D_j(x), y \rangle = \langle x, D_j(y) \rangle$ for all $x, y \in H$. Therefore,

$$\lambda_{mj}\langle \psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle = \langle D_j(\psi_{mj}), \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle = \langle \psi_{mj}, D_j(\widehat{\psi}_{lj}) \rangle.$$

The sample eigenpair $(\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj})$ is defined through the equation $\widehat{D}_j(\widehat{\psi}_{lj})(r) = \widehat{\lambda}_{lj}\widehat{\psi}_{lj}(r)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\widehat{\lambda}_{lj} - \lambda_{mj})\langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj} \rangle \\ &= (\widehat{\lambda}_{lj} - \lambda_{mj})\langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle \\ &= \langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, \widehat{\lambda}_{lj}\widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle - \lambda_{mj}\langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle \\ &= \langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, \widehat{D}_j(\widehat{\psi}_{lj}) \rangle - \langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, D_j(\widehat{\psi}_{lj}) \rangle \\ &= \langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, (\widehat{D}_j - D_j)(\widehat{\psi}_{lj}) \rangle \\ &= \langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, (\widehat{D}_j - D_j)(s_{lj}\psi_{lj}) \rangle + \langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, (\widehat{D}_j - D_j)(\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$|\langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, (\widehat{D}_j - D_j)(\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}) \rangle| \leq \|(\widehat{D}_j - D_j)(\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj})\| \leq \|\widehat{D}_j - D_j\|_S \|\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}\|$$

which is $O_P(T^{-1})$ by the consistency of the primitives. Therefore, with Lemma 16,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\widehat{\lambda}_{lj} - \lambda_{mj})\langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj} \rangle \\ &= \langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, (\widehat{D}_j - D_j)(s_{lj}\psi_{lj}) \rangle + O_P(T^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{mj}s_{lj} \left((f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt} - E[f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt}]) + (f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt} - E[f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt}]) \right) + O_P(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

This term is $O_P(T^{-1/2})$ because $(f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt} - E[f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt}]) + (f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt} - E[f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt}])$ is mean zero α -mixing of size $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$ and satisfies the conditions for the central limit theorem for alpha-mixing sequences. Therefore, with $|\widehat{\lambda}_{lj} - \lambda_{lj}| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$,

$$(\widehat{\lambda}_{lj} - \lambda_{lj})\langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj} \rangle = O_P(T^{-1}),$$

and we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda_{lj} - \lambda_{mj})\langle s_{mj}\psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{mj}s_{lj} \left((f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt} - E[f_{mjt}^* y_{ljt}]) + (f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt} - E[f_{ljt}^* y_{mjt}]) \right) + O_P(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the result follows. \square

Lemma 18. $\sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \langle \varepsilon_{jt}^*, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} - \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle = O_P(1)$.

Proof. With $\int_a^b \beta_j(r, q) E[X_{jt}(q) \varepsilon_{jt}(s)] dq = 0$ it follows that $E[f_{mjt}^* \varepsilon_{jt}(s)] = 0$. Further, because $f_{mjt}^* = f_{mjt} + \langle \varepsilon_{jt}, \psi_{mj} \rangle$ and $\varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) = \varepsilon_{jt}(s) - \sum_{m=1}^{K_j} \langle \varepsilon_{jt}, \psi_{mj} \rangle \psi_{mj}(s)$ we have $E[f_{mjt}^* \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s)] = 0$. Therefore, $z_t^* \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s)$ is a zero mean alpha-mixing sequence of order $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$ with

$$\int_a^b \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^* \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) \right\|_2^2 ds = O_P(1),$$

which follows by the central limit theorem for alpha-mixing sequences. Furthermore, with Lemma 8,

$$\int_a^b \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) \right\|_2^2 ds = O_P(1).$$

Consequently, by the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives,

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \langle \varepsilon_{jt}^*, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} - \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle \right\|_2^2 \leq \|s_{lj} \psi_{lj} - \widehat{\psi}_{lj}\|_2^2 \int_a^b \left\| \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) \right\|_2^2 ds = O_P(1).$$

□

Lemma 19. $\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \langle \widehat{\mu}_j - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T SE[z_t^*] s_{lj} f_{ljt}^* + o_P(1)$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \langle \widehat{\mu}_j - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{lj} f_{ljt}^* \right) + O_P(T^{-1/2}) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T S z_t^* \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{lj} f_{ljt}^* \right) + O_P(T^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T E[S z_t^*] s_{lj} f_{ljt}^* + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Lemma 14 in the first line, Lemma 8 in the second line, and the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing sequences in the third line. □

Lemma 20.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} - \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq l}}^{K_j} SE[z_t^* f_{mjt}^*] \frac{s_{mj} g_{lmjt}}{\lambda_{lj} - \lambda_{mj}} + o_P(1).$$

Proof. The j -th regressor function admits the representation $X_{jt}(s) - \mu_j(s) = (F_{lj}^*)'(\Psi_j(s)) + \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s)$, where $\varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) = X_{jt}(s) - \mu_j(s) - (F_{lj}^*)'(\Psi_j(s))$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} - \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{m=1}^{K_j} \widehat{z}_t f_{mjt}^* s_{mj} \langle s_{mj} \psi_{mj}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \langle \varepsilon_{jt}^*, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} - \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq l}}^{K_j} \widehat{z}_t f_{mjt}^* s_{mj} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{h=1}^T \frac{g_{lmjh}}{\lambda_{lj} - \lambda_{mj}} \right) + O_P(T^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Lemmas 15, 17, and 18. Furthermore,

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t f_{mjt}^* = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T S z_t^* f_{mjt}^* + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\widehat{z}_t - S z_t^*) f_{mjt}^* = SE[z_t^* f_{mjt}^*] + o_P(1)$$

by Lemma 8 and the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing sequences, and the result follows. \square

Lemma 21. $|\widehat{u}_t(r) - u_t(r)| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Proof. With $u_t(r) = Y_t(r) - (S z_t^*)' S B(r)$ and $\widehat{u}_t(r) = Y_t(r) - \widehat{z}_t' \widehat{B}(r)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{u}_t(r) - u_t(r)| &= |(S z_t^*)' S B(r) - \widehat{z}_t' \widehat{B}(r)| \\ &= |(S z_t^* - \widehat{z}_t)' S B(r) + \widehat{z}_t' (S B(r) - \widehat{B}(r))| \\ &\leq \|S z_t^* - \widehat{z}_t\|_2 \|B(r)\|_2 + \|\widehat{z}_t\|_2 \|S B(r) - \widehat{B}(r)\|_2 = O_P(T^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

by the triangle inequality, bounded fourth moments, and Lemmas 8 and 12. \square

Lemma 22. $|\widehat{f}_{ljt} - s_{lj} f_{ljt}^*| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Proof. With Cauchy-Schwarz, bounded fourth moments, and the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives,

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{f}_{ljt} - s_{lj} f_{ljt}^*| &= |\langle X_{jt} - \widehat{\mu}_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle - \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle| \\ &= |\langle \mu_j - \widehat{\mu}_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle + \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj} \rangle| \\ &\leq \|\mu_j - \widehat{\mu}_j\| + \|X_{jt} - \mu_j\| \|\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}\| = O_P(T^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 23. $|\widehat{g}_{lmjt} - g_{lmjt}| = o_P(1)$.

Proof. Analogously to the proof of Lemma 22,

$$|\widehat{y}_{ljt} - s_{lj} y_{ljt}| \leq \|E[Y_t] - \bar{Y}\| + \|Y_t - E[Y_t]\| \|\widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj} \psi_{lj}\| = O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

and, therefore,

$$\widehat{f}_{mjt}\widehat{y}_{ljt} - s_{mj}s_{lj}f_{mjt}^*y_{ljt} = (\widehat{f}_{mjt} - s_{mj}f_{mjt}^*)\widehat{y}_{ljt} + s_{mj}f_{mjt}^*(\widehat{y}_{ljt} - s_{lj}y_{ljt}) = O_P(T^{-1/2})$$

by Lemma 22, Cauchy-Schwarz, and bounded fourth moments. By similar arguments,

$$\overline{f_{mj}y_{lj}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{f}_{mjt}\widehat{y}_{ljt} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{mj}f_{mjt}^*s_{lj}y_{ljt} + O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

and by the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing sequences,

$$\overline{f_{mj}y_{lj}} = s_{mj}s_{lj}E[f_{mjt}^*y_{ljt}] + o_P(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{g}_{lmjt} - g_{lmjt} &= (\widehat{f}_{mjt}\widehat{y}_{ljt} - s_{mj}s_{lj}f_{mjt}^*y_{ljt}) - (\overline{f_{mj}y_{lj}} - s_{mj}s_{lj}E[f_{mjt}^*y_{ljt}]) \\ &\quad + (\widehat{f}_{ljt}\widehat{y}_{mjt} - s_{mj}s_{lj}f_{mjt}^*y_{mjt}) - (\overline{f_{lj}y_{mj}} - s_{mj}s_{lj}E[f_{ljt}^*y_{mjt}]) \\ &= o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 24.

$$\widetilde{A}(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T Sz_t^*u_t(r) + \sum_{j=1}^J \left(SE[z_t^*(F_{jt}^*)'S_j - SE[z_t^*(F_{jt}^*)']G_{jt}] \right) B_j(r) + o_P(1),$$

and $\widetilde{A}(r) = O_P(1)$, where $\widetilde{A}(r)$ is defined in (30) and G_{jt} is defined in (32)

Proof. Since $\beta_j(r) = (B_j(r))'\Psi_j(s)$, we have $\int_a^b \beta_j(r, s)X_{jt}(s) ds = (B_j(r))'F_{jt}^*$ and the regression equation can be represented as $Y_t(r) = (Sz_t^*)'SB(r) + u_t(r)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{A}(r) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t u_t(r) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t (Sz_t^* - \widehat{z}_t)'SB(r) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t u_t(r) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{z}_t \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \left(\langle \widehat{\mu}_j - \mu_j, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle + \langle X_{jt} - \mu_j, s_{lj}\psi_{lj} - \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle \right) s_{lj}\beta_{lj}(r) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(Sz_t^*u_t(r) + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{K_j} \left(SE[z_t^*]s_{lj}f_{ljt}^* - \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq l}}^{K_j} SE[z_t^*f_{mjt}^*]s_{mj} \frac{g_{lmjt}}{\lambda_{lj} - \lambda_{mj}} \right) s_{lj}\beta_{lj}(r) \right) \\ &\quad + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Lemmas 13, 19, and 20. We have $\tilde{A}(r) = O_P(1)$ by the central limit theorem for alpha-mixing sequences because $z_t^* u_t(r)$, $f_{l_{jt}}^*$, and $g_{lm_{jt}}$ have mean zero and are alpha-mixing of size $-\nu/(\nu - 2)$. \square

Lemma 25.

$$\tilde{A}(r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\hat{z}_t \hat{u}_t(r) + \sum_{j=1}^J \bar{z} \hat{F}'_{jt} \hat{B}_j(r) - \bar{z} F'_j \hat{G}_{jt} \hat{B}_j(r) \right) + o_P(1)$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 24 together with the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives, the facts that

$$\bar{z} - E[\hat{z}_t] = o_P(1), \quad \bar{z} F'_j - E[\hat{z}_t \hat{F}'_{jt}] = o_P(1)$$

by the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing sequences, and Lemmas 8, 12, 21, 22, 23. \square

Lemma 26. *Let $\{v_{ij}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\text{span}(\psi_{1j}, \dots, \psi_{K_j j})^\perp$. Then,*

$$\sqrt{T} \langle \hat{\psi}_{lj}, v_{ij} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\lambda_{lj}} \langle \hat{\varepsilon}_{jt}, v_{ij} \rangle \langle s_{lj} \gamma_{lj}, Y_t - E[Y_t] \rangle + o_P(1).$$

Proof. With $\hat{D}_j = \hat{C}_j \hat{C}_j^*$ we have

$$\langle \hat{\psi}_{lj}, v_{ij} \rangle = \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_{lj}} \langle \hat{D}_j(\hat{\psi}_{lj}), v_{ij} \rangle = \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_{lj}} \langle \hat{C}_j^*(\hat{\psi}_{lj}), \hat{C}_j^*(v_{ij}) \rangle,$$

where

$$\hat{C}_j^*(v_{mj})(r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \langle \hat{\varepsilon}_{jt}, v_{ij} \rangle (Y_t(r) - \bar{Y}(r)), \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_{jt}(s) = X_{jt}(s) - \hat{\mu}_j(s) - \hat{F}'_{jt} \hat{\Psi}_j(s),$$

and, by Lemma 22 and the consistency of \bar{Y} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_j^*(\hat{\psi}_{lj})(r) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{f}_{l_{jt}} (Y_t(r) - \bar{Y}(r)) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{lj} f_{l_{jt}}^* (Y_t(r) - E[Y_t(r)]) + O_P(T^{-1/2}) \\ &= s_{lj} \gamma_{lj}(r) + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing sequences implying

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{l_{jt}}^* (Y_t(r) - E[Y_t(r)]) \xrightarrow{P} \gamma_{lj}(r) = E[f_{l_{jt}}^* (Y_t(r) - E[Y_t(r)])].$$

Therefore,

$$\sqrt{T}\langle\widehat{\psi}_{lj}, v_{ij}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}} \langle\widehat{\varepsilon}_{jt}, v_{ij}\rangle \langle s_{lj}\gamma_{lj}, Y_t - \bar{Y} \rangle + o_P(1),$$

and the results follows by the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives, Cauchy-Schwarz, and bounded fourth moments. \square

Lemma 27. $|\widehat{\varepsilon}_{jt}(s) - \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s)| = O_P(T^{-1/2})$.

Proof. This follows by the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives, Lemma 22, Cauchy-Schwarz, and bounded fourth moments. \square

Lemma 28. $|\widehat{\gamma}_{lj}(s) - s_{lj}\gamma_{lj}(s)| = o_P(1)$.

Proof. By the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives, Lemma 22, Cauchy-Schwarz, and bounded fourth moments,

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{lj}(s) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T s_{lj} f_{ljt}^*(Y_t(r) - E[Y_t(r)]) + O_P(T^{-1/2}),$$

and the result follows by the law of large numbers for alpha-mixing sequences. \square

Lemma 29.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T}(\widehat{\psi}_{lj}(s) - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}(s)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq l}}^{K_j} \frac{g_{lmjt}}{\lambda_{lj} - \lambda_{mj}} s_{mj}\psi_{mj}(s) + \frac{1}{\lambda_{lj}} \varepsilon_{jt}^*(s) \langle s_{lj}\gamma_{lj}, Y_t - E[Y_t] \rangle \right) + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\{v_{ij}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\text{span}(\psi_{1j}, \dots, \psi_{K_jj})^\perp$. Then, $\{\widehat{\psi}_{lj}\}_{l=1}^{K_j} \cup \{v_{il}\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $L^2[a, b]$. Using the representation of $\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\psi}_{lj}(s) - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}(s))$ with respect to this basis, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T}(\widehat{\psi}_{lj}(s) - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}(s)) \\ &= \sqrt{T} \sum_{m=1}^{K_j} \langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}, \psi_{mj} \rangle \psi_{mj}(s) + \sqrt{T} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}, v_{ij} \rangle v_{ij}(s) \\ &= \sqrt{T} \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq l}}^{K_j} \langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj} - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}, \psi_{mj} \rangle \psi_{mj}(s) + \sqrt{T} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \widehat{\psi}_{lj}, v_{ij} \rangle v_{ij}(s) + O_P(T^{-1/2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq l}}^{K_j} \frac{s_{mj} g_{lmjt}}{\lambda_{lj} - \lambda_{mj}} s_{mj}\psi_{mj}(s) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_{lj}} \langle \widehat{\varepsilon}_{jt}, v_{ij} \rangle \langle s_{lj}\gamma_{lj}, Y_t - E[Y_t] \rangle v_{ij}(s) \right) + o_P(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq l}}^{K_j} \frac{g_{lmjt}}{\lambda_{lj} - \lambda_{mj}} s_{mj}\psi_{mj}(s) + \frac{1}{\lambda_{lj}} \widehat{\varepsilon}_{jt}(s) \langle s_{lj}\gamma_{lj}, Y_t - E[Y_t] \rangle \right) + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we applied Lemma 15 in the third line, Lemmas 17 and 26 in the fourth line, and the fact that $\langle \widehat{\varepsilon}_{jt}, \widehat{\psi}_{lj} \rangle = 0$ by construction implying $\widehat{\varepsilon}_{jt}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \widehat{\varepsilon}_{jt}, v_{ij} \rangle v_{ij}(s)$ in the fifth line. Finally, the result follows by Lemma 27. \square

Lemma 30.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T}(\widehat{\psi}_{lj}(s) - s_{lj}\psi_{lj}(s)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq l}}^{K_j} \frac{\widehat{g}_{lmjt}}{\widehat{\lambda}_{lj} - \widehat{\lambda}_{mj}} \widehat{\psi}_{mj}(s) + \frac{1}{\widehat{\lambda}_{lj}} \widehat{\varepsilon}_{jt}(s) \langle \widehat{\gamma}_{lj}, Y_t - \bar{Y} \rangle \right) + o_P(1) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 29 and by the \sqrt{T} -consistency of the primitives, Cauchy-Schwarz, bounded fourth moments, and Lemmas 23, 27, and 28. \square

A.5. Specification of the simulated coefficient functions

The bivariate coefficient functions in the simulation chapter can be expressed in matrix notation as

$$\beta_j(r, s) = (V(r))' \mathcal{B}_j V(s),$$


where $V(r) = (v_1(r), v_2(r), \dots, v_K(r))'$ is a $K \times 1$ vector of Fourier basis functions evaluated at r , and \mathcal{B}_j is a $K \times K$ matrix.

In our implementation, we have two slope functions $j = \{1, 2\}$ with $K = 3$ for both of them and we set


$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.03 & 0.09 & 0.15 \\ 0.11 & -0.94 & 0.26 \\ -0.30 & -0.17 & 0.21 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \mathcal{B}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.41 & -0.29 & -0.28 \\ -0.42 & -0.26 & 0.09 \\ -0.73 & -0.12 & 0.15 \end{bmatrix}.$$

These specific choices of \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 ensure that $\text{rank}(\beta_j(r, s)) = K$.


A.6. Functional regression coefficients and confidence regions



(a) $\hat{\varphi}_1(r, s)$: impact of $P_{t-1}(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.




(b) $\hat{\varphi}_2(r, s)$: impact of $P_{t-2}(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.




(c) $\hat{\varphi}_5(r, s)$: impact of $P_{t-5}(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.


Figure A1: First column panels show the estimated functional regression coefficients of model (26). Second and third column panels display the lower and upper confidence regions of the 95% confidence interval. The estimated number of factors used in this analysis are shown in Table 2. The underlying German power market data spans all working days between 2012 and 2017.



(d) $\widehat{\beta}_{1,1}(r, s)$: impact of $L_t(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.




(e) $\widehat{\beta}_{1,2}(r, s)$: impact of $L_{t-1}(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.




(f) $\widehat{\beta}_{1,5}(r, s)$: impact of $L_{t-5}(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.


Figure A1: First column panels show the estimated functional regression coefficients of model (26). Second and third column panels display the lower and upper confidence regions of the 95% confidence interval. The estimated number of factors used in this analysis are shown in Table 2. The underlying German power market data spans all working days between 2012 and 2017 (cont.).



(g) $\widehat{\beta}_{2,1}(r, s)$: impact of $G_t(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.




(h) $\widehat{\beta}_{2,2}(r, s)$: impact of $G_{t-1}(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.




(i) $\widehat{\beta}_{2,5}(r, s)$: impact of $G_{t-5}(s)$ on $P_t(r)$.

Figure A1: First column panels show the estimated functional regression coefficients of model (26). Second and third column panels display the lower and upper confidence regions of the 95% confidence interval. The estimated number of factors used in this analysis are shown in Table 2. The underlying German power market data spans all working days between 2012 and 2017 (cont.).


A.7. Functional pointwise p-values



(a) *p*-value regions for the price regression coefficients $\hat{\varphi}_1(r, s)$, $\hat{\varphi}_2(r, s)$ and $\hat{\varphi}_5(r, s)$.



(b) *p*-value regions for the load regression coefficients $\hat{\beta}_{1,1}(r, s)$, $\hat{\beta}_{1,2}(r, s)$ and $\hat{\beta}_{1,5}(r, s)$.



(c) *p*-value regions for the wind- and solar generation regression coefficients $\hat{\beta}_{2,1}(r, s)$, $\hat{\beta}_{2,2}(r, s)$ and $\hat{\beta}_{2,5}(r, s)$.

Figure A2: Pointwise *p*-values from a two-tailed *t*-test on difference to zero. Dark red color indicates smaller values and the contour lines as defined in the legends indicate significance according to standard alpha levels of 0.01, 0.05 and 0.1.