

Homogeneity Pursuit in Single Index Models based Panel Data Analysis

Heng Lian

Department of Mathematics
City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Xinghao Qiao

Department of Statistics
London School of Economics, United Kingdom

Wenyang Zhang

Department of Mathematics
The University of York, United Kingdom

Abstract

Panel data analysis is an important topic in statistics and econometrics. Traditionally, in panel data analysis, all individuals are assumed to share the same unknown parameters, e.g. the same coefficients of covariates when the linear models are used, and the differences between the individuals are accounted for by cluster effects. This kind of modelling only makes sense if our main interest is on the global trend, this is because it would not be able to tell us anything about the individual attributes which are sometimes very important. In this paper, we proposed a modelling based on the single index models embedded with homogeneity for panel data analysis, which builds the individual attributes in the model and is parsimonious at the same time. We develop a data driven approach to identify the structure of homogeneity, and estimate the unknown parameters and functions based on the identified structure. Asymptotic properties of the resulting estimators are established. Intensive simulation studies conducted in this paper also show the resulting estimators work very well when sample size is finite. Finally, the proposed modelling is applied to a public financial dataset and a UK climate dataset, the results reveal some interesting findings.

Keywords and phrases: *Binary segmentation, B-Spline, homogeneity pursuit, single index models.*

1 Introduction

1.1 Preamble

Panel data analysis is an important topic in statistics and econometrics. The traditional approach for analysing panel data assumes all individuals share the same unknown parameters, and uses cluster effects to account for the difference between individuals. For example, when the linear models are used, the coefficients of the covariates are assumed to be the same across all individuals, i.e.

$$y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m; \quad t = 1, \dots, T,$$

where y_{it} and \mathbf{X}_{it} , a $(p + 1)$ -dimensional vector, are respectively the t th observations of the response variable and covariate of the i th individual. ϵ_{it} , $t = 1, \dots, T$, are correlated for any given i , and the cluster effects are included in ϵ_{it} . See Hsiao (2014) and the reference therein. Whilst this modelling idea is useful when the global trend of the impact of a covariate on the response variable is of our main interest, it does not tell us anything about the individual attributes which are sometimes very important.

In order to explore the individual attributes, we need to make them more concrete and distinctive in modelling. A simple approach to do so would be using

$$y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \epsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m; \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (1.1)$$

to fit the data. However, this modelling approach would result in $m(p + 1)$ unknown coefficients to estimate, which is too many, because m is usually of the magnitude of hundreds, or even more, in practice. This modelling also ignores the similarity which may exist among some individuals. Such similarity may have very important practical meaning, and could lead to some important findings in practice. In addition to that, statistically speaking, the modelling, like (1.1) without any conditions imposed, would also pay a price on variance side of the estimators resulted because the available information is not used up.

In order to explore the individual attributes and account for the similarity among some individuals at the same time, Ke et al. (2015) proposed a penalised likelihood/least squares based approach to pursue the homogeneity in the linear models, i.e. (1.1), used for panel data analysis, under the framework of treating homogeneity as a kind of sparsity. Regression under homogeneity condition has also been studied by quite a few recent works, e.g. Tibshirani et al. (2005); Friedman et al. (2007); Bondell and Reich (2008); Jiang et al. (2013), and the references therein. Like Ke et al. (2015), the methods in these works are all based on penalised likelihood/least squares. Ke et al. (2016) took a different approach, they formulated the homogeneity pursuit problem as a problem of change point detection and applied the binary segmentation approach to identify the homogeneity in the linear models with interactive effects.

The existing literature about homogeneity pursuit mainly focuses on the linear models. It is well known that the linearity condition may not hold for many datasets, and the exploration of

linear relationship is not sufficient in many cases. As a consequence, the semiparametric modelling is becoming more and more useful in panel data analysis. Among various semiparametric models, the single index models have many advantages, and are a very successful tool in data analysis, see Härdle and Stoker (1989); Carroll et al. (1997); Yu and Ruppert (2002); Zhu and Xue (2006); Xia (2008); Peng and Huang (2011); Zhu et al. (2012); Guo et al. (2017), and the reference therein. In this paper, we are going to investigate the homogeneity pursuit in the single index models used for panel data analysis. The detailed definition of the models we are going to address in this paper is given in Section 1.2

1.2 The single index models with homogeneity structure

Let y_{it} and \mathbf{X}_{it} , a $(p+1)$ -dimensional vector, be respectively the t th observations of the response variable and covariate of the i th individual, $i = 1, \dots, m$; $t = 1, \dots, T$. We consider the models

$$y_{it} = g_i(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) + \epsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m; \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$g_i(\cdot) = \begin{cases} g_{(1)}(\cdot) & \text{when } i \in G_{1,1}, \\ g_{(2)}(\cdot) & \text{when } i \in G_{1,2}, \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ g_{(H_1)}(\cdot) & \text{when } i \in G_{1,H_1}, \end{cases} \quad \beta_{ij} = \begin{cases} \beta_{(1)} & \text{when } (i, j) \in G_{2,1}, \\ \beta_{(2)} & \text{when } (i, j) \in G_{2,2}, \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \beta_{(H_2)} & \text{when } (i, j) \in G_{2,H_2}, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

$\mathbb{G}_1 = \{G_{1,k} : k = 1, \dots, H_1\}$ is a partition of set $\{1, \dots, m\}$, $\mathbb{G}_2 = \{G_{2,k} : k = 1, \dots, H_2\}$ is a partition of set $\{(i, j) : i = 1, \dots, m; j = 1, \dots, p\}$, β_{ij} is the $(j+1)$ th component of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$, and

$$E(\epsilon_{it} | \mathbf{X}_{it}) = 0, \quad \text{var}(\epsilon_{it} | \mathbf{X}_{it}) = \sigma^2.$$

The condition (1.3) is the homogeneity structure of the standard single index models for panel data analysis. $\{G_{1,k} : k = 1, \dots, H_1\}$ and $\{G_{2,k} : k = 1, \dots, H_2\}$ are unknown partitions. H_1 and H_2 are unknown integers, H_1 is much smaller than m , H_2 is much smaller than mp . $g_{(k)}(\cdot)$, $k = 1, \dots, H_1$, are unknown functions to be estimated, and $\beta_{(k)}$, $k = 1, \dots, H_2$, are unknown parameters to be estimated.

Let $\beta_{i0} = 1$ be the first component of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$. In the literature, the most commonly used identification condition for the single index models is $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_i\| = 1$ and $\beta_{i0} > 0$, or $\beta_{i0} = 1$. We choose the latter in this paper.

The models (1.2) together with (1.3) show that the homogeneity pursuit in the single index models for panel data analysis is even more important than that in the linear models, this is because we would have to estimate m unknown functions and mp unknown parameters in order to explore the individual attributes, if the homogeneity pursuit is not conducted. However, if the homogeneity pursuit is conducted, we only need to estimate H_1 , much smaller than m , unknown functions and H_2 , much smaller than mp , unknown parameters when the homogeneity

exists. Even without taking into account the benefit resulted from the homogeneity pursuit for the parametric part of the models, just for the part of unknown functions alone, to estimate much fewer functions would make a big difference in the obtained estimators, in terms of the stability of the estimators.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We begin in Section 2 with a description of the proposed estimation procedure which is embedded with a binary segmentation based homogeneity pursuit. The asymptotic properties of the proposed estimators are presented in Section 3. The performance of the proposed estimation procedure and homogeneity pursuit method, when sample size is finite, are assessed by simulation studies in Section 4. In Section 5, applying the single index models (1.2) together with the homogeneity structure (1.3) to the 49 Industry Portfolios data set, which can be freely downloaded from Kenneth French's website

http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/data_library.html,

and the UK climate data, which can be freely downloaded from

<http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/public/weather/climate-historic>,

we will show the advantages of the proposed statistical methodology. We leave all technical proofs of the asymptotic properties in the Appendix.

2 Estimation procedure

2.1 Estimation method

Our approach to deal with the unknown functions $g_i(\cdot)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, in (1.2) is based on the B-Spline. To achieve the best result for the homogeneity pursuit, we have to decompose all $g_i(\cdot)$ s by the same B-Spline basis, $\mathbf{B}(\cdot) = (B_1(\cdot), \dots, B_K(\cdot))^T$.

For each i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, let $\tilde{\beta}_i$ be the estimate of β_i obtained, based on the observations for the i th individual, by a standard estimation procedure for the single index models, e.g. the method in Yu and Ruppert (2002) or in Härdle and Stoker (1989), and

$$a = \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \min_{1 \leq t \leq T} \mathbf{X}_{it}^T \tilde{\beta}_i, \quad b = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \mathbf{X}_{it}^T \tilde{\beta}_i.$$

We use the B-Spline basis of order s in this paper, and the basis, $\mathbf{B}(\cdot)$, is formed by the equally spaced knots, τ_k , $k = 0, \dots, K - s + 1$, on the interval $[a, b]$, with $\tau_0 = a$ and $\tau_{K-s+1} = b$. Based on the basis $\mathbf{B}(\cdot)$, $g_i(\cdot)$ can be decomposed as

$$g_i(\cdot) \approx \mathbf{B}(\cdot)^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (\theta_{i1}, \dots, \theta_{iK})^T$. So, to get the estimator of $g_i(\cdot)$, we only need to get the estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$.

Our estimation procedure for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ and β_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, consists of three stages: in the first stage, for each i , we estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ and β_i only based on the observations for the i th individual,

and treat the obtained estimators as initial estimators; we identify, in the second stage, the homogeneity structure in the $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ s and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ s based on the initial estimators obtained in the first stage; in the final stage, we estimate the $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ s and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ s under the identified homogeneity structure.

We now present the details of the estimation procedure.

Stage 1 (*Initial Estimation*). Let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i = (\beta_{i1}, \dots, \beta_{ip})^\top$, which is $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ with the first component, which is always 1, being dropped. For each i , based on the observations for the i th individual, approximating $g_i(\cdot)$ by its decomposition (2.1) and applying the least squares estimation method, we have the following objective function

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \left(y_{it} - \mathbf{B}^\top (\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \boldsymbol{\theta}_i \right)^2. \quad (2.2)$$

Minimise (2.2) with respect to $(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i^\top, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^\top)$, and denote the resulting minimiser by $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i^\top, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i^\top)$.

We will show how to conduct the minimisation in Section 2.2.

Stage 2 (*Homogeneity Pursuit*). Let $\tilde{\beta}_{ij}$ be the j th component of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i$, we sort $\tilde{\beta}_{ij}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, in ascending order, and denote them by

$$b_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq b_{(mp)}.$$

We use R_{ij} to denote the rank of $\tilde{\beta}_{ij}$. Identifying the homogeneity among $\tilde{\beta}_{ij}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, is equivalent to detecting the change points among $b_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \dots, mp$. To this end, we apply the Binary Segmentation algorithm as follows.

For any $1 \leq i < j \leq mp$, let

$$\Delta_{ij}(\kappa) = \sqrt{\frac{(j - \kappa)(\kappa - i + 1)}{j - i + 1}} \left| \frac{\sum_{l=\kappa+1}^j b_{(l)}}{j - \kappa} - \frac{\sum_{l=i}^{\kappa} b_{(l)}}{\kappa - i + 1} \right|.$$

Given a threshold δ , the Binary Segmentation algorithm to detect the change points works as follows

(1) Find \hat{k}_1 such that

$$\Delta_{1,mp}(\hat{k}_1) = \max_{1 \leq \kappa < mp} \Delta_{1,mp}(\kappa).$$

If $\Delta_{1,mp}(\hat{k}_1) \leq \delta$, there is no change point among $b_{(l)}$, $l = 1, \dots, mp$, and the process of detection ends. Otherwise, add \hat{k}_1 to the set of change points and divide the region $\{\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq mp\}$ into two subregions: $\{\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq \hat{k}_1\}$ and $\{\kappa : \hat{k}_1 + 1 \leq \kappa \leq mp\}$.

(2) Detect the change points in the two subregions obtained in (1), respectively. Let us deal with the region $\{\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq \hat{k}_1\}$ first. Find \hat{k}_2 such that

$$\Delta_{1,\hat{k}_1}(\hat{k}_2) = \max_{1 \leq \kappa < \hat{k}_1} \Delta_{1,\hat{k}_1}(\kappa).$$

If $\Delta_{1,\hat{k}_1}(\hat{k}_2) \leq \delta$, there is no change point in the region $\{\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq \hat{k}_1\}$. Otherwise, add \hat{k}_2 to the set of change points and divide the region $\{\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq \hat{k}_1\}$ into

two subregions: $\{\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq \hat{k}_2\}$ and $\{\kappa : \hat{k}_2 + 1 \leq \kappa \leq \hat{k}_1\}$. For the region $\{\kappa : \hat{k}_1 + 1 \leq \kappa \leq mp\}$, we find \hat{k}_3 such that

$$\Delta_{\hat{k}_1+1, mp}(\hat{k}_3) = \max_{\hat{k}_1+1 \leq \kappa < mp} \Delta_{\hat{k}_1+1, mp}(\kappa).$$

If $\Delta_{\hat{k}_1+1, mp}(\hat{k}_3) \leq \delta$, there is no change point in the region $\{\kappa : \hat{k}_1 + 1 \leq \kappa \leq mp\}$. Otherwise, add \hat{k}_3 to the set of change points and divide the region $\{\kappa : \hat{k}_1 + 1 \leq \kappa \leq mp\}$ into two subregions: $\{\kappa : \hat{k}_1 + 1 \leq \kappa \leq \hat{k}_3\}$ and $\{\kappa : \hat{k}_3 + 1 \leq \kappa \leq mp\}$.

- (3) For each subregion obtained in (2), we do exactly the same as that for the subregion $\{\kappa : 1 \leq \kappa \leq \hat{k}_1\}$ or $\{\kappa : \hat{k}_1 + 1 \leq \kappa \leq mp\}$ in (2), and keep doing so until there is no subregion containing any change point.

We sort the estimated change point locations in ascending order and denote them by

$$\hat{k}_{(1)} < \hat{k}_{(2)} < \cdots < \hat{k}_{(\hat{H}_{-1})},$$

where \hat{H}_{-1} is the number of change points detected. In addition, we denote $\hat{k}_{(0)} = 0$, $\hat{H}_2 = \hat{H}_{-1} + 1$, and $\hat{k}_{(\hat{H}_2)} = mp$.

We use \hat{H}_2 to estimate H_2 . Let

$$\hat{G}_{2,s} = \{(i, j) : \hat{k}_{(s-1)} < R_{ij} \leq \hat{k}_{(s)}\}, \quad 1 \leq s \leq \hat{H}_2,$$

we use $\{\hat{G}_{2,s} : 1 \leq s \leq \hat{H}_2\}$ to estimate the partition $\{G_{2,s} : 1 \leq s \leq H_2\}$. We consider all the β_{ij} s with the subscript (i, j) in the same member of the estimated partition having the same value.

Let $\tilde{\theta}_{ij}$ be the j th component of $\tilde{\theta}_i$. Doing exactly the same to $\tilde{\theta}_{ij}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, K$, we get a partition $\{\hat{G}_{1,1}, \dots, \hat{G}_{1,\hat{H}_1}\}$ of $\{(i, j) : i = 1, \dots, m; j = 1, \dots, K\}$. We consider all the θ_{ij} s with subscript (i, j) in the same member of the estimated partition having the same value.

Stage 3 (Final Estimation). Let $L(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\hat{H}_2}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{\hat{H}_1})$ be

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T \left(y_{it} - \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \boldsymbol{\theta}_i \right)^2. \quad (2.3)$$

with β_{ij} , $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, being replaced by η_k if $(i, j) \in \hat{G}_{2,k}$, and θ_{ij} , $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, K$, being replaced by ξ_s if $(i, j) \in \hat{G}_{1,s}$. Let $(\hat{\eta}_1, \dots, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{H}_2}, \hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{\hat{H}_1})$ minimise $L(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\hat{H}_2}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{\hat{H}_1})$. The final estimator $\hat{\beta}_{ij}$ of β_{ij} is $\hat{\eta}_k$ if $(i, j) \in \hat{G}_{2,k}$, and the final estimator $\hat{\theta}_{ij}$ of θ_{ij} is $\hat{\xi}_s$ if $(i, j) \in \hat{G}_{1,s}$. Once we have the estimator $\hat{\theta}_{ij}$, the estimator $\hat{g}_i(\cdot)$ of $g_i(\cdot)$ is taken to be $\mathbf{B}(\cdot)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i$.

Remark 1 When dealing with the unknown functions $g_i(\cdot)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, in the estimation procedure, instead of treating each unknown function as a single undivided unit to conduct homogeneity pursuit, we work on the coefficients of its B-Spline decomposition. This is because there may still be some kind of homogeneity between two functions even if they are different. For example, for two different functions, it could be the case that some coefficients of the B-Spline decomposition of one function are the same as some coefficients of the B-Spline decomposition of another one. If we treat each unknown function as a single undivided unit to conduct homogeneity pursuit, we would not identify or use this kind of homogeneity, which would make our final estimators not as efficient as they should.

2.2 Computational algorithm

In the estimation procedure described in Section 2.1, the minimiser of (2.2) does not have a closed form, neither does the minimiser of $L(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\hat{H}_2}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{\hat{H}_1})$. To conduct the minimisation of either of the two objective functions, we appeal to the standard NLS algorithm, and use the `nlsLM` of `minpack.lm` package in R to implement it. One can also use other NLS software, for example, the NLS routine `lsqnonlin()` from MATLAB and `PROC NLIN` from SAS. To use the `nlsLM` of `minpack.lm` package in R, we first need to find an initial value. The initial value for minimising (2.2) can be obtained as follows:

- (1) Apply the standard least squares estimation for the linear models to $(y_{it}, \mathbf{X}_{it})$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, and denote the resulting estimator by $\check{\beta}_i$, the initial value for β_i is taken to be $\beta_i^{(0)} = \check{\beta}_{i0}^{-1} \check{\beta}_i$, $\check{\beta}_{i0}$ is the first component of $\check{\beta}_i$.
- (2) Substitute $\beta_i^{(0)}$ for β_i in (2.2), then minimise (2.2) with respect to θ_i , the minimiser $\theta_i^{(0)}$ is the initial value of θ_i .

Once we have $\beta_i^{(0)}$ and $\theta_i^{(0)}$, the minimiser of (2.2) can be obtained by the `nlsLM` of `minpack.lm` package in R straightforwardly.

For any set A , let $|A|$ be the number of elements in A . The initial value for minimising $L(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\hat{H}_2}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{\hat{H}_1})$ can be obtained through the initial estimates of β_i and θ_i , obtained in Stage 1 of the estimation procedure in Section 2.1, as follows:

$$\eta_s^{(0)} = \left(|\hat{G}_{2,s}| \right)^{-1} \sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{G}_{2,s}} \tilde{\beta}_{ij}, \quad s = 1, \dots, \hat{H}_2$$

and

$$\xi_s^{(0)} = \left(|\hat{G}_{1,s}| \right)^{-1} \sum_{(i,j) \in \hat{G}_{1,s}} \tilde{\theta}_{ij}, \quad s = 1, \dots, \hat{H}_1.$$

Once we have the initial value $(\eta_1^{(0)}, \dots, \eta_{\hat{H}_2}^{(0)}, \xi_1^{(0)}, \dots, \xi_{\hat{H}_1}^{(0)})$, we can have the minimiser of $L(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\hat{H}_2}, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{\hat{H}_1})$ by using the `nlsLM` of `minpack.lm` package in R straightforwardly.

2.3 Selection of tuning parameters

The threshold δ in the Stage 2 of the proposed estimation procedure, described in Section 2.1, plays a key role for the success of the homogeneity pursuit. As far as the implementation of the homogeneity pursuit is concerned, the selection of δ is equivalent to the selection of \hat{H}_1 and \hat{H}_2 , and to select an integer is easier, therefore, in this section, instead of selecting δ , we develop a cross-validation procedure to select the two tuning parameters, \hat{H}_1 and \hat{H}_2 .

For the single index model (1.2) where \mathbf{X}_{it} 's are independent across $t = 1, \dots, T$, we implement a L -fold cross validation approach. In particular, for a given pair $\{H_1, H_2\}$, we remove $1/L$ th of the observed time points for $\{(y_{it}, \mathbf{X}_{it}), i = 1, \dots, m, t = 1, \dots, T\}$ as a validation set, estimate the single index model (1.2) with identified homogeneity structure on the remaining data, compute the squared error between y_{it} and fitted values $\hat{g}_i(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i) = \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i) \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i$, on the validation set, and repeat this procedure L times to calculate the cross-validated mean squared error and its corresponding standard error. We search over a grid of $\{H_1, H_2\}$ values and apply the one-standard-error rule to choose the smallest model for which the estimated cross-validated error is within one standard error of the lowest point on the error surface. The rationale here is that if a set of models appear to be more or less equally good, then we might tend to choose the simplest model. Across the candidate pairs, $\{\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2\}$, whose corresponding errors are within this deviation, one can choose the smallest \hat{H}_1 after selecting the smallest \hat{H}_2 or switch the selection order or select the smallest value of $\hat{H}_1 + \hat{H}_2$, we take the first approach since it produces better model selection consistency in our numerical experiments. A similar one-standard-deviation-rule technique has been adopted to choose the regularisation parameter with a smaller model size for the lasso problems (James et al.; 2013).

When \mathbf{X}_{it} 's are time dependent panel data, we implement a rolling procedure to perform cross-validation for time series. More specifically, for each $r = L, L - 1, \dots, 1$, we rollingly treat $\{(y_{it}, \mathbf{X}_{it}), i = 1, \dots, m, t = 1, \dots, T - r\}$ as training observations and $\{(y_{i,T-r+1}, \mathbf{X}_{i,T-r+1}), i = 1, \dots, m\}$ as validation set, calculate the squared error between each y_{it} and its fitted value. Finally, we apply the one-standard-deviation-rule on the lowest cross-validated mean squared error and choose \hat{H}_2 and \hat{H}_1 .

In the cross-validation procedure when we need make predictions for validation set, the domain in $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i)$ for training data set might not cover that for validation set. We adopt the idea in Wang and Yang (2009) by mapping $\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ to $F_i(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$, where F_i is the distribution function of $\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i$. We then implement the estimation procedure described in Section 2.1 by decomposing $g_i(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \approx \mathbf{B}^T(F_i(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)) \boldsymbol{\theta}_i$. The proposed approach is thus able to make predictions and, as demonstrated by some numerical studies, provides very similar sample performance in terms of estimation accuracy.

2.4 Post-processing step

We equip the Binary-Segmentation-algorithm-based homogeneity pursuit with an additional step aimed to enhance the accuracy of detected change-points locations through a fine-scale search. To be specific, at each change-point, we re-calculate $\Delta_{ij}(\kappa)$ over the interval between two adjacent change-points and identify the new change-point location to replace the old one. We perform this post-processing procedure by iteratively cycling through all neighbouring change-points and fine-tuning the change-points locations. This procedure is terminated when the set of change-points does not change. Our numerical experiments show that this extra post-processing step apparently improve the accuracy of each estimated change-point location and hence the identified homogeneity structure for model (1.2).

3 Asymptotic properties

In this section, we are going to investigate the asymptotic behaviour of the estimators obtained by the proposed estimation procedure, which we call correct-fitting, and compare with the estimators obtained without homogeneity pursuit, which is the initial estimators obtained in the Stage 1 in the proposed estimation procedure, we call it over-fitting, and the estimators obtained under the assumption that all individuals share the same index (namely, $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_m$), which we call under-fitting. The asymptotic theory presented in this section is in the sense that $T \rightarrow \infty$, and m, p are all possibly diverging to infinity but H_1, H_2 are fixed. This agrees with many applications in which H_1 and H_2 are expected to be small and thus significant reduction of unknown parameters can be achieved by clustering the parameters. To make the presentation neat, we state the asymptotic theorems in this section and leave all technical proofs in the Appendix.

Let $\epsilon_t = (\epsilon_{1t}, \dots, \epsilon_{mt})^T$,

$$\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} = (X_{it,1}, \dots, X_{it,p})^T, \quad y_t = (y_{1t}, \dots, y_{mt})^T, \quad \mathbf{X}_t = (\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{mt}^T)^T.$$

In this paper, we assume $(y_t, \mathbf{X}_t, \epsilon_t)$ are stationary with $\alpha(l) \leq \rho^l$ for some $\rho < 1$, and ϵ_t is independent of \mathbf{X}_t . Note that unlike Vogt and Linton (2015), we do not need to assume independence or stationarity of variables cross i .

We start with the asymptotic properties of the estimators obtained without homogeneity pursuit. The convergence rate of the estimator $\tilde{\beta}_{ij}$ is of order $T^{-1/2}$, and the convergence rate of the estimator $\tilde{g}_i(u)$ is of order $T^{-2/5}$, which is as expected as we assumed the functions are twice differentiable.

Theorem 1 (*Over-fitting case*). *For any $i, i = 1, \dots, m$, and $1 \leq j \leq p$, under the conditions (C1)-(C4) and (C5') in the Appendix, we have*

$$T^{1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{ij}^T \tilde{\Theta}_2 \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{ij})^{-1/2} \left(\tilde{\beta}_{ij} - \beta_{ij} \right) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1)$$

and

$$T^{2/5}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^T(u)\tilde{\Theta}_1\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i(u))^{-1/2}(\tilde{g}_i(u) - g_i(u) - r_i(u)) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1),$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{ij}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i(u)$ are unit vectors, $\tilde{\Theta}_1, \tilde{\Theta}_2$ are matrices with eigenvalues bounded and bounded away from zero, all these quantities are defined in the proof in the Appendix A.4. The bias term $r_i(u) = g_i(u) - \mathbf{B}^T(u)\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}$ satisfies $|r_i(u)| \leq CK^{-2}$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}$ is the vector of spline coefficients used to approximate g_i as defined in Appendix A.1. parameter of g_i as defined in assumption (C3).

Let m_i be the size of $G_{1,h}$ that contains i , and m_{ij} be the size of $G_{2,h}$ that contains β_{ij} . To make the statement about the correct-fitting case cleaner, we assume that all m_i are of the same order and all m_{ij} are of the same order ($\max_{i,j} m_{ij}/\min_{i,j} m_{ij}$ and $\max_i m_i/\min_i m_i$ are bounded) in the following theorem, which shows in particular that the convergence rate of the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{ij}$ is of order $(mpT)^{-1/2}$, and the convergence rate of the estimator $\hat{g}_i(u)$ is of order $(mT)^{-2/5}$.

Theorem 2 (Correct-fitting case). For any $i, i = 1, \dots, m$, and $1 \leq j \leq p$, under the conditions (C1)-(C6) in the Appendix, we have

$$(mpT)^{1/2}(\mathbf{e}_{ij}^T\Theta_2\mathbf{e}_{ij})^{-1/2}(\hat{\beta}_{ij} - \beta_{ij}) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1)$$

and

$$(mT)^{2/5}(\mathbf{b}_i^T(u)\Theta_1\mathbf{b}_i(u))^{-1/2}(\hat{g}_i(u) - g_i(u) - r_i(u)) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, 1),$$

where \mathbf{e}_{ij} and $\mathbf{b}_i(u)$ are unit vectors, Θ_1, Θ_2 are matrices with eigenvalues bounded and bounded away from zero, all these quantities are defined in the proof in the Appendix A.4.

Finally, for the under-fitting case, let $\check{\beta}_i$ and $\check{g}_i(\cdot)$ be the estimators of β_i and $g_i(\cdot)$ obtained under the assumption that all individuals share the same unknown parameters.

Theorem 3 (Under-fitting case). Suppose the β_i s are sufficiently separated in the sense that for $\bar{\beta} := \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i/m$,

$$\frac{1}{mp} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\beta_i - \bar{\beta}\|^2 \geq c$$

for some $c > 0$, then

$$\frac{1}{mp} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\check{\beta}_i - \beta_i\|^2 \geq c.$$

Similarly, if

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \int |g_i(u) - \bar{g}(u)|^2 du \geq c,$$

where $\bar{g}(u) = m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m g_i(u)$, then

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \int |\check{g}_i(u) - g_i(u)|^2 du \geq c.$$

4 Simulation studies

In this section, we are going to use a simulated example to demonstrate how accurate the proposed estimation is. We will also show much loss it would inflict if the homogeneity structure is ignored or mistakenly specified as that all individuals share the same index coefficients or the same link function.

Example. We generate a sample from model (1.2) with $p = 2$ and WLOG an even m ,

$$g_i(u) = \begin{cases} \sin(\pi u/4) & \text{when } i = 1, 2, \dots, m/2, \\ \cos(\pi u/4) & \text{when } i = m/2 + 1, \dots, m, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\beta_i = \begin{cases} (1, -1.5\sqrt{0.2}, -0.5\sqrt{0.2})^\top & \text{when } i = 1, 3, \dots, m-1, \\ (1, 0.5\sqrt{0.2}, 1.5\sqrt{0.2})^\top & \text{when } i = 2, 4, \dots, m, \end{cases}$$

where $\|\beta_i\|^2 = 1.5$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let \mathbf{X}_{it} and ϵ_{it} , $i = 1, \dots, m$, $t = 1, \dots, T$ be independently generated from $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1.5}}N(\mathbf{0}_3, \mathbf{I}_3)$ truncated by $[-1.343, 1.343]^3$ (the range of 5th to 95th quantiles for $N(0, 2/3)$) and $N(0, \sigma^2)$, respectively. Once \mathbf{X}_{it} and ϵ_{it} are generated, y_{it} can be generated through (1.2).

We conduct the simulated example for various m s and T s with $\sigma = 0.2$, and compare our proposed approach to its potential competitors based on the following performance metrics:

- (1) *Estimation accuracy.* For an estimator $\hat{\beta}_i$ of β_i , we use the mean squared error (MSE), namely $\text{MSE}(\hat{\beta}_i) = E\left(\|\hat{\beta}_i - \beta_i\|^2\right)$, to assess the estimation error of $\hat{\beta}_i$. Analogously, for an estimator $\hat{g}_i(\cdot)$ of $g_i(\cdot)$, its estimation accuracy can be evaluated based on the mean integrated squared error,

$$\text{MISE}(\hat{g}_i) = E\left\{\int (\hat{g}_i(u) - g_i(u))^2 du\right\}.$$

To avoid the situation where the performance is dominated by the poor boundary behaviour, we let the integral domain to be non-boundary region, which is between the 1st and 99th quantiles of $\{\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \beta_i, t = 1, \dots, T\}$.

- (2) *Homogeneity structure identification consistency.* To evaluate the distance between the detected homogeneity structure and the true one, we use the normalized mutual information (NMI) (Ke et al.; 2015), which measures the similarity between two partitions. Suppose $\mathbb{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{D} = \{D_1, D_2, \dots\}$ are two partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, the NMI is defined as

$$\text{NMI}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{D}) = \frac{I(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{D})}{[H(\mathbb{C}) + H(\mathbb{D})]/2},$$

where

$$I(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{D}) = \sum_{k,j} (|C_k \cap D_j|/n) \log(n|C_k \cap D_j|/|C_k||D_j|)$$

and

$$H(\mathbb{C}) = - \sum_k (|C_k|/n) \log(|C_k|/n).$$

The NMI takes values in $[0, 1]$ with larger values indicating higher level of similarity between two partitions. For an estimated partition $\hat{\mathbb{G}}_2 = \{\hat{G}_{2,1}, \dots, \hat{G}_{2,\hat{H}_2}\}$ of $\{(i, j) : 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, p\}$, obtained in the Stage 2 of the proposed estimation procedure in Section 2.1, we calculate $\text{NMI}(\hat{\mathbb{G}}_2, \mathbb{G}_2)$ to assess how close to the true homogeneity structure in β_{ij} s the estimated one is. Similarly, for an estimated partition $\hat{\mathbb{G}}_1$ of $\{i : 1, \dots, m\}$, we use $\text{NMI}(\hat{\mathbb{G}}_1, \mathbb{G}_1)$ to evaluate how close the estimated homogeneity structure in $g_i(\cdot)$ s is to the true one.

For each case, we apply either the single index model (1.2) with the standard estimation procedure, the initial estimation of the proposed estimation procedure in Section 2.1, which we call over-fitting (Over), the single index model (1.2) with the homogeneity structure (1.3) together with the proposed estimation procedure, which we call correct-fitting, the single index model (1.2) with all individuals share the same index vector (namely, $\beta_1 = \dots = \beta_m$), which we call Under-I, the single index model (1.2) with all individuals share the same link function (namely, $g_1(\cdot) = \dots = g_m(\cdot)$, i.e. $\theta_1 = \dots = \theta_m$), which we call Under-F, or the single index model (1.2) with all individuals share both the same index and link function, which we call Under-I-F, to the simulated data set.

We develop three methods under the correct-fitting case. The first approach, named Correct-C, optimises (2.3) based on the estimated *componentwise* homogeneity structure in β_{ij} s and θ_{ij} s, obtained in the Stage 2 of the proposed estimation procedure in Section 2.1 with the tuning parameters selected through the cross-validation approach described in Section 2.3. The second approach, Correct-V, is the same as the first approach but optimises (2.3) based on the estimated componentwise homogeneity structure in β_{ij} s and *vectorwise* homogeneity structure in θ_i s which can be obtained through the estimated componentwise homogeneity structure in θ_{ij} s. The third approach, which we call Correct-NMI, is the same as the second approach but with the tuning parameters selected to be the one maximising $\text{NMI}(\hat{\mathbb{G}}_2, \mathbb{G}_2)$ and $\text{NMI}(\hat{\mathbb{G}}_1, \mathbb{G}_1)$. In practice without knowing the true homogeneity structure, one cannot implement Correct-NMI.

Under-I, Under-F and Under-I-F are three kinds of under-fitting. For Under-I or Under-F, the homogeneity structure in θ_i s or β_{ij} s is estimated in the same way as that in the proposed estimation procedure in Section 2.1 with the tuning parameters still selected by the one-standard-deviation-rule cross-validation approach.

We compare over-fitting, correct-fittings and under-fittings to the oracle case where the true homogeneity structure is used. The computational algorithms for the under-fitting and oracle estimators are the same as that for the correct-fitting, but use either identified or pre-specified homogeneity structure. We compare the sample performance of all eight approaches in our conducted simulation study.

We report the results for estimation errors and NMIs for β_i s and $g_i(\cdot)$ s averaged over 100 replicates in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. In terms of estimation error, the overall estimation accuracy is improved as m and T increase and three correct-fitting approaches perform very well as reflected in their lower values of MSEs and MISEs. Among the three methods, Correct-NMI provides the best performance even producing very comparable MSEs and MISEs with the oracle estimator and Correct-C is outperformed by Correct-V in most settings. This is somewhat expected, since, unlike Correct-C, which optimises (2.3) based on the detected homogeneity structure in β_{ij} s and θ_{ij} s, Correct-V separates the final estimation step from the cross-validation procedure, which is used to identify the homogeneity structure in β_{ij} s and θ_{ij} s. Analogously, Correct-NMI solves a separate optimisation after detecting the homogeneity structure based on the largest NMIs. It is also worth noting that the over-fitting and under-fitting methods, which either ignores or mistakenly specify the homogeneity structure, provide much worse results, highlighting the importance of incorporating the appropriate homogeneity structure. In terms of selecting the structure of homogeneity, we observe that three correct-fitting methods produce perfect identifications of homogeneity structure in β_{ij} s and Correct-NMI provides the largest NMI values indicating that it can effectively recover the true homogeneity structure in $g_i(\cdot)$ s. The performance of Correct-C and Correct-V deteriorates when m increases, this is intuitively due to the increased m values and the cross-validation procedure, which tends to choose a larger number of change points as m increases, resulting in smaller NMI values for $\hat{\mathbb{G}}_1$.

5 Real data analysis

We will illustrate the proposed method with two real data examples in this section.

5.1 Industrial Portfolio's return

We first study the data set about $m = 49$ Industrial Portfolios' daily simple return from 1/8/2015 to 31/12/2015. This data set can be freely downloaded from Kenneth French's website

http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/data_library.html

This data set has been analysed in quite a few literature. For example, Guo et al. (2017) used this data set to demonstrate the performance of a newly developed dynamic portfolio allocation. In this paper, we are going to explore the homogeneity structure in this data set by our proposed method.

Let y_{it} be the daily simple return of the i th portfolio at the t th day, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, and $\mathbf{X}_{it} = (X_{t1}, X_{t2}, X_{t3})^T$ be the observation of the Fama-French three factors, where X_{t1} , X_{t2} , X_{t3} respectively represent the market (Rm-Rf), size (SMB) and value (HML) factors at the t th day.

Table 1: **The Average of $\text{MSE}(\hat{\beta}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and Average NMIs for $\hat{\mathbb{G}}_2$**
All entries for MSEs are 10^4 times their actual values

T		400			800		
m		30	60	90	30	60	90
MSE	Oracle	0.380	0.205	0.133	0.214	0.128	0.101
	Correct-C	0.473	0.221	0.147	0.157	0.093	0.085
	Correct-V	0.381	0.208	0.134	0.214	0.129	0.100
	Correct-NMI	0.381	0.206	0.133	0.214	0.128	0.101
	Over	5.438	5.285	5.246	2.636	2.689	2.663
	Under-I-F	4005.6	4002.6	4002.1	4003.4	4001.5	4001.1
	Under-I	4002.4	4001.7	4001.3	4001.8	4001.0	4000.6
	Under-F	21.233	3.393	2.259	3.111	1.454	1.123
NMI	Oracle	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Correct-C	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Correct-V	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Correct-NMI	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Over	0.339	0.290	0.267	0.339	0.290	0.267
	Under-I-F	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Under-I	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Under-F	0.817	0.810	0.807	0.812	0.809	0.806

Table 2: **The Average of $\text{MISE}(\hat{g}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and Average NMIs for \hat{G}_1**
where all entries for MISEs are 10^2 times their actual values

		400			800		
T	m	30	60	90	30	60	90
MISE	Oracle	0.260	0.249	0.243	0.251	0.241	0.236
	Correct-C	0.667	0.553	0.485	0.366	0.318	0.307
	Correct-V	0.300	0.289	0.311	0.257	0.246	0.246
	Correct-NMI	0.266	0.254	0.249	0.252	0.241	0.238
	Over	0.548	0.544	0.540	0.410	0.403	0.396
	Under-I-F	87.988	87.963	87.959	88.746	88.726	88.647
	Under-I	10.099	9.853	9.952	9.770	9.719	9.711
	Under-F	85.196	85.240	85.235	86.017	86.035	85.952
NMI	Oracle	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Correct-C	0.816	0.790	0.637	0.958	0.948	0.881
	Correct-V	0.816	0.790	0.637	0.958	0.948	0.881
	Correct-NMI	0.965	0.966	0.948	0.994	0.997	0.997
	Over	0.339	0.290	0.267	0.339	0.290	0.267
	Under-I-F	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Under-I	0.811	0.797	0.783	0.901	0.894	0.900
	Under-F	0	0	0	0	0	0

We apply the single index model (1.2) with the unknown homogeneity structure (1.3) to fit the data set. From interpretation point of view, the homogeneity structure in the unknown link functions, $g_i(\cdot)$ s, where each $g_i(\cdot)$ is treated as a single undivided unit would make much more sense than the homogeneity structure in the coefficients of the B-Spline decompositions of $g_i(\cdot)$ s. Therefore, we use the Correct-V, described in Section 4, to identify the homogeneity structure in β_{ij} s or $g_i(\cdot)$ s, and estimate the unknown parameters and unknown functions.

In the implementation of the Correct-V, we implement the method in Section 2.1 with the tuning parameters selected by the cross-validation for time series as described in Section 2.3. Specifically, we define the cross-validated mean squared error

$$CV = \frac{1}{mL} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=T-L+1}^T (y_{it} - \hat{y}_{it})^2 \quad (5.1)$$

where $L = 30$. Note that we here do not apply the one-standard-rule when performing the cross validation to select the tuning parameters for identifying the homogeneity structure, since we have already selected a small enough model with 11 and 2 detected groups in index coefficients and link functions, respectively. Table 3 provides the identified clustering results for β_{i2} , β_{i3} , $g_i(\cdot)$, $i = 1, \dots, 49$, and Figure 1 plots the estimated link functions. We observe a few apparent patterns. Firstly, the estimated link functions are very linear indicating the linear relationship between portfolio returns and Fama-French three factors, which has been verified by broad empirical studies. Secondly, many portfolios belonging to similar industrials were grouped into the same cluster for the estimated index coefficients, e.g. Hardw, Softw and Agric, Food, Soda were clustered into Groups 8 and 4 in terms of the estimated coefficients for factors SMB and HML respectively.

5.2 UK climate data

Our second data set, which is available from the UK Met Office website

<http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/public/weather/climate-historic>,

contains monthly data of the mean daily maximum temperature (TMAX), mean daily minimum temperature (TMIN), days of air frost (AF), total rainfall (RAIN) and total sunshine duration (SUN) collected from 37 stations across the UK. We first remove the missing values and thus select data during the period of January 1993 to December 2009 from 16 locations. We then eliminate the seasonality and trend effects and standardise the data. Let y_{it} be the monthly mean temperature, which can be calculated as $(TMAX+TMIN)/2$, and $\mathbf{X}_{it} = (X_{it1}, X_{it2}, X_{it3})^T$ be the observations for AF, RAIN and SUN, from the i th station at the t th month, $i = 1, \dots, 16$, $t = 1, \dots, T$,

Like the analysis of the Industrial Portfolio's return data set, we apply the single index model (1.2) with unknown homogeneity structure (1.3) together with the proposed estimation procedure, Correct-V, to the data set. Table 4 provides the clustering results for the index

Table 3: **Grouping Results for The Index Coefficients for SMB, HML and Link Functions of 49 Industrial Portfolios**

	Agric	Food	Soda	Beer	Smoke	Toys	Fun	Books	Hshld	Clths
SMB	6	5	6	4	2	8	9	7	6	6
HML	4	4	4	3	4	5	3	4	5	6
Function	ii	i	ii	ii	i	i	i	i	i	ii
	Hth	MedEq	Drugs	Chems	Rubbr	Txtls	BldMt	Cnstr	Steel	FabPr
SMB	9	8	9	7	7	8	8	8	9	10
HML	2	2	1	6	4	4	6	6	9	7
Function	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	ii
	Mach	ElcEq	Autos	Aero	Ships	Guns	Gold	Mines	Coal	Oil
SMB	8	9	7	6	8	6	10	9	11	9
HML	8	6	6	6	7	4	10	7	11	9
Function	i	i	i	i	i	i	ii	i	ii	i
	Util	Telcm	PerSv	BusSv	Hardw	Softw	Chips	LabEq	Paper	Boxes
SMB	4	8	8	7	8	8	7	7	6	6
HML	5	4	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	6
Function	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i
	Trans	Whlsl	Rtail	Meals	Banks	Insur	RIEst	Fin	Other	
SMB	7	7	7	7	7	6	7	6	7	
HML	6	6	4	3	6	5	5	5	6	
Function	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	i	ii	




Figure 1: Plots of estimated link functions with respect to $\{\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \hat{\beta}_i, t = 1, \dots, T\}$.

coefficients and link functions, where 4 and 2 groups were selected respectively. Figure 2 plots the estimated link functions at 16 stations.

It is very interesting to see, from Table 4, that Oxford, Hurn, Eastbourne and Bradford share exactly the same model, which implies the impact of rainfall or total sunshine duration on monthly mean temperature has exactly the same pattern in these four areas. The same finding also appears in the three areas of Waddington, Sheffield and Heathrow, the two areas of Ross-On-Wye and Eskdalemuir, and the two areas of Paisley and Leuchars. If we only focus on the impact of rainfall on monthly mean temperature, the seven areas of Waddington, Sheffield, Shawbury, Paisley, Leuchars, Lerwick and Heathrow would have exactly the same pattern. Similar finding also appears for the impact of total sunshine duration on monthly mean temperature.

Table 4: **Grouping Results for The Index Coefficients for RAIN, SUN and Link Functions at 16 Locations**

	Waddington	Sheffield	Shawbury	Ross-On-Wye	Paisley	Oxford	Leuchars	Lerwick
RAIN	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4
SUN	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	4
Function	i	i	i	ii	i	i	i	i
	Hurn	Heathrow	Eskdalemuir	Eastbourne	Cambridge	Camborne	Bradford	Armagh
RAIN	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4
SUN	2	1	2	2	1	3	2	2
Function	i	i	ii	i	i	i	i	ii

Appendix A. Proofs of Main Results

A.1 Assumptions and notations

Below we use subscript 0 to indicate the true value. We impose the following assumptions.

- (C1) $(y_t, \mathbf{X}_t, \epsilon_t), t = 1, \dots, T$ is stationary and α -mixing with mixing coefficient $\alpha(l) \leq \rho^l$ for some $\rho \in (0, 1)$. ϵ_{it} has mean zero, with variance uniformly bounded, and is independent of $\{\mathbf{X}_{1t}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{mt}\}$. The variables $X_{it,j}$ are uniformly bounded. The density of $\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}$, denoted by $f_i(x)$, is supported on an interval of length, say, L and $Lf_i(x)$ is bounded and bounded away from zero on its support, uniformly over i .
- (C2) Let $\sigma_{ii',l} = E[\epsilon_{it}\epsilon_{i't'}]$ with $|t - t'| = l$. We assume $\sum_{l=1}^T |\sigma_{ii',l}| \leq \tau_{ii'}$ for some $\tau_{ii'} > 0$ and $\max_i \sum_{i'} \tau_{ii'} \leq M$ for some constant M .
- (C3) The link functions g_{0i} are twice continuously differentiable. We also assume $E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} | \mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i = x]$ is twice continuously differentiable for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}$.




Figure 2: Plots of estimated link functions with respect to $\{\mathbf{X}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{it}, t = 1, \dots, T\}$.

- (C4) Both $E[\mathbf{X}_{it}\mathbf{X}_{it}^T]$ and $E[(g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} - E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}|\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i])^{\otimes 2}]$ have eigenvalues bounded and bounded away from zero, uniformly over i and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}$, where for any matrix \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{A}^{\otimes 2} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T$.
- (C5) H_1 and H_2 are fixed and $\max_{i,j} m_{ij}/\min_{i,j} m_{ij}$ and $\max_i m_i/\min_i m_i$ are bounded, and we set $K \asymp (mT)^{1/5}$. Assume $\frac{m^{6/5}p\log T}{T^{3/5}} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{(K^3+p^2)p(\log T)^3}{T} \rightarrow 0$.
- (C6) Assume $mK\sqrt{\log(Tm)/T} \ll \delta_1 \ll \gamma_1$, where γ_1 is the minimum jump size for the sequence $\theta_{0(1)} \leq \dots \leq \theta_{0(mK)}$ at the change points, and δ_1 is the threshold used in the change point detection algorithm (we stop partitioning if the test statistic is below δ_1). Similarly, assume $mp\sqrt{\log(Tm)/T} \ll \delta_2 \ll \gamma_2$, where γ_2 and δ_2 are similarly defined for the sequence $\beta_{0(1)} \leq \dots \leq \beta_{0(mp)}$.

Remark 2 (C1) contains some mild regularity assumptions. Assuming $X_{it,j}$ to be bounded is common in estimation with B-splines since the basis functions are constructed on a compact interval. If p is fixed, we can simply assume the density of $\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}$ is bounded and bounded away from zero. Our assumption however deals with the case p is diverging and thus the length of the support of the density is also diverging. (C2) roughly means the dependence across i is not too strong. If m is fixed, (C2) follows from the geometric mixing assumption. Assumptions similar to (C2) were also used in Bai (2003) to impose weak dependence among errors. Note Vogt and Linton (2015) made the stronger assumption that the data are independent across i which also easily implies (C2). (C3) contains smoothness condition for some functions and (C4) contains some identifiability conditions usually assumed in single-index models and involves the projection one typically use to profile out the nonparametric part. Uniformity over i in various assumptions above is void if m is fixed. (C5) specifies the required divergence rate for T, m, p, K . Finally, (C6) is used in showing that stage 2 of our estimation procedure can identify the true partition with probability approaching one.

When considering the estimator in stage 1 of our estimation procedure, we can replace (C5) with the following.

- (C5') We set $K \asymp T^{1/5}$, and assume $(K+p)p\log T/T^{3/5} \rightarrow 0$, $(K^3+p^2)p(\log T)^3/T \rightarrow 0$.

Due to assumption (C3), there exists $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{01}^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0m}^T)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i} = (\theta_{0i1}, \dots, \theta_{0iK})^T$ such that $\sup_x |g_{0i}(x) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(x)| \leq CK^{-2}$. Here and below we use C to denote a generic positive constant whose value can change even on the same line. We use $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ to denote the operator norm of a matrix (the operator norm is the same as the largest singular value) and use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the Frobenius norm of a matrix. We use $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$ to denote the L^2 norm of functions and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the sup-norm for vectors (maximum absolute value of the components).

Assume the true partition of components of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$ is given by $\cup_{h=1}^{H_1} G_{1,h} = \{1, \dots, mK\}$ and $\cup_{h=1}^{H_2} G_{2,h} = \{1, \dots, mp\}$, respectively. The unique values of the components of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ are denoted by $\boldsymbol{\xi}_0 = (\xi_{01}, \dots, \xi_{0H_1})^T \in R^{H_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = (\eta_{01}, \dots, \eta_{0H_2})^T \in R^{H_2}$, respectively. Let $\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1}$ be the $K \times H_1$ binary matrix whose (k, h) entry is 1 if $\theta_{0ik} = \xi_h$ and 0 otherwise. We have

$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i} = \mathbf{J}_i^{G_1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_0$. Similarly, we define $\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i} = \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} \boldsymbol{\eta}_0$. The sizes of $G_{1,h}$ and $G_{2,h}$ are denoted by $|G_{1,h}|$ and $|G_{2,h}|$, respectively. Finally, let \mathbf{D}^{G_1} and \mathbf{D}^{G_2} be the diagonal matrix with entries $\sqrt{|G_{1,h}|}$ and $\sqrt{|G_{2,h}|}$, respectively.

A.2 Proof summary

We first define the oracle estimator as the minimizer $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ of

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \boldsymbol{\theta}_i)^2,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i = (1, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i^T)^T = (1, \beta_{i1}, \dots, \beta_{ip})^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (\theta_{i1}, \dots, \theta_{iK})^T$ with the constraint that components of $\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1^T, \dots, \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_m^T)^T$ in the same partition take the same value and components of $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^T)^T$ in the same partition take the same value. Here we assume the partition is the true partition, thus the name ‘‘oracle’’. To make our arguments applicable to over-fitting case, we note that all arguments carry over when the partition used in the oracle estimator is finer than the true partition and thus Theorem 1 is actually a special case.

In A.3-A.4, we show that the oracle estimator satisfies the asymptotic normality properties stated in Theorem 2 (we also obtained convergence rate and asymptotic normality for the entire vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, see for example (A.11) and (A.13)). Also, Theorem 1 follows directly as a special case that each component of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ forms its own group in the partition. Then we show that the change points can be consistently estimated, and thus the estimator we obtain in stage 3 will be exactly the same as the oracle estimator using the true partition, with probability approaching one, and Theorem 2 is proved.

A.3 Proof of asymptotic property for the oracle estimator

In this part we consider the asymptotic property of the oracle estimator, denoted by $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ in this section, which assumed knowledge of the true partitions. For clarity of presentation, the proof is split into several steps and the proofs of some lemmas were relegated to Appendix B.

STEP 1. Prove the convergence rate $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\| = O_p(\sqrt{(H_1 + H_2)/T} + \sqrt{m}K^{-2})$.

In this section, when we use $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, we always assume $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = \mathbf{J}_i^{G_1} \boldsymbol{\xi}$ for some $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in R^{H_1}$ (that is, components of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are partitioned in the same way as is the true $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$). It is easy to see that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| = \|\mathbf{D}^{G_1}(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)\|$. Similarly, we always assume $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i = \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ for some $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in R^{H_2}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\| = \|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\|$.

Define $r_T = \sqrt{(H_1 + H_2)/T} + \sqrt{m}K^{-2}$. We only need to show that

$$\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 = Lr_T^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 > 0$$

with probability approaching one, if L is large enough.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 \\
&= \sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 - 2(\epsilon_{it} - r_{it})(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})),
\end{aligned}$$

where $r_{it} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})$ with $|r_{it}| \leq CK^{-2}$.

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 \\
&= \sum_{i,t} \left((\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i})^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T (\boldsymbol{\beta}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \right)^2 \\
&= T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^T - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{01}^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1^T - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{01}^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^T - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0m}^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_m^T - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0m}^T) \cdot \\
& \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{01} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{01} \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{m1} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_m - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{m1} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= T((\boldsymbol{\xi}^T - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0^T) \mathbf{D}^{G_1}, (\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0^T) \mathbf{D}^{G_2}) \\
& \quad \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{D}^{G_1})^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & (\mathbf{D}^{G_2})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{J}_1^{G_1})^T & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & (\mathbf{J}_m^{G_1})^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & (\mathbf{J}_1^{G_2})^T & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & (\mathbf{J}_m^{G_2})^T \end{pmatrix} \\
& \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_1^{G_1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_1^{G_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{J}_m^{G_1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_m^{G_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{D}^{G_1})^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & (\mathbf{D}^{G_2})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}^{G_1} (\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) \\ \mathbf{D}^{G_2} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{ii'} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) & \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T \end{pmatrix} \right], 1 \leq i, i' \leq m,$$

$\mathbf{B}'(\cdot) = (B'_1(\cdot), \dots, B'_K(\cdot))^T$ are the first derivatives of the basis functions and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i^*$ lies between $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$.

By Lemma 3, eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{ii}$ are bounded and bounded away from zero, with probability

approaching one. Furthermore, it is easy to directly verify that

$$\mathbf{O} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_1^{G_1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_1^{G_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{J}_m^{G_1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{J}_m^{G_2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{D}^{G_1})^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & (\mathbf{D}^{G_2})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

is an orthonormal matrix (that is, $\mathbf{O}^T \mathbf{O} = \mathbf{I}$). Thus

$$\sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 \asymp T(\|\mathbf{D}^{G_1}(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\|^2) = T(\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now consider the term $(\epsilon_{it} - r_{it})(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,t} \epsilon_{it} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) \\ &= \sum_t (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^T - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{01}^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1^T - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{01}^T, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^T - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0m}^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_m^T - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0m}^T) \cdot \\ & \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{01}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{1t} \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{mt}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_m) \epsilon_{mt} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0m}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{mt}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_m^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{mt} \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \sum_t ((\boldsymbol{\xi}^T - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0^T) \mathbf{D}^{G_1}, (\boldsymbol{\eta}^T - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0^T) \mathbf{D}^{G_2}) \mathbf{O}^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{01}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{1t} \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{mt}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_m) \epsilon_{mt} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0m}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{mt}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_m^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{mt} \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\|\mathbf{D}^{G_1}(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\|^2} \left\| \sum_t \mathbf{O}^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{01}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{1t} \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{mt}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_m) \epsilon_{mt} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0m}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{mt}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_m^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{mt} \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix} \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{O} is as defined in (A.1). We have

$$E \left\| \sum_t \mathbf{O}^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{01}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{1t}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_1^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{1t} \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{mt}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_m) \epsilon_{mt} \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0m}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{mt}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_m^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{mt} \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{tr} \left(\sum_{1 \leq t, t' \leq T} \mathbf{O}^T \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11,|t-t'|} \sigma_{11,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{1m,|t-t'|} \sigma_{1m,|t-t'} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{m1,|t-t'|} \sigma_{m1,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{mm,|t-t'|} \sigma_{mm,|t-t'} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{O} \right) \\
&= \text{tr} \left(\sum_{1 \leq t, t' \leq T} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11,|t-t'|} \sigma_{11,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{1m,|t-t'|} \sigma_{1m,|t-t'} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{m1,|t-t'|} \sigma_{m1,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{mm,|t-t'|} \sigma_{mm,|t-t'} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}^T \right) \\
&\leq \text{tr}(\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}^T) \cdot \left\| \sum_{1 \leq t, t' \leq T} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11,|t-t'|} \sigma_{11,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{1m,|t-t'|} \sigma_{1m,|t-t'} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{m1,|t-t'|} \sigma_{m1,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{mm,|t-t'|} \sigma_{mm,|t-t'} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{op}, \quad (\text{A.3})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_{ii',|t-t'} = \text{Cov}(\epsilon_{it}, \epsilon_{i't'})$,

$$\mathbf{A}_{ii',|t-t'} = E \left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{i't'}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) & \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i'}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{i't'}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}^*) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i't'} \end{pmatrix} \right],$$

and the last step above uses von Neumann's trace inequality (Mirsky; 1975). By Lemma 4 and that $\text{tr}(\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}^T) = H_1 + H_2$ (note $\mathbf{O}^T \mathbf{O} = \mathbf{I}_{H_1+H_2}$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i,t} \epsilon_{it} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) \\
&= O_p(\sqrt{(\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2)(H_1 + H_2)T}). \quad (\text{A.4})
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i,t} r_{it} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) \\
&= C\sqrt{mT}K^{-2} \cdot O_p(\sqrt{T}(\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2)) \quad (\text{A.5})
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (A.2)–(A.5),

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 > 0$$

with probability approaching one, if $\|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 = Lr_T^2$ with L sufficiently large. Thus there is a local minimizer $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ with $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\| + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| = O_p(r_T)$.

STEP 2. Proof of convergence rate of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and its asymptotic normality.

Let $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_i$ be $T \times K$ matrices, $i = 1, \dots, m$, with rows $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})$. Define $\mathbf{V}_{it} = g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}$, $\mathbf{P}_i = \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^T$ with rows $\mathbf{P}_{it}^T = \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^T \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^T$. We write, for any $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 \leq Cr_T^2$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 \leq CH_2/T$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i,t} (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 \\
&= \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} + g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}) - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) - R_{it})^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{it} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i})^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T (\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) + (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i})^T (\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) + \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T (\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) \\ &\quad - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) \\ &= \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \right\} + \left\{ (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i})^T (\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) \right\} \\ &\quad + \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T (\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) - \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) \right\} \\ &\quad + \left\{ (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) \right\} \\ &= R_{it1} + R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{it1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})$ and $R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)$ contains all other terms above. It is easy to see $R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) = 0$. In the decomposition above R_{it2} consists of three terms, which we denote by $R_{it2,1}$, $R_{it2,2}$ and $R_{it2,3}$, respectively (omitting the dependence in $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}$ for simplicity of notation). Using $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 \leq Cr_T^2$, we can easily show

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,t} R_{it2,1}^2 &= O_p(Tr_T^4 K^3), \\ \sum_{i,t} R_{it2,2}^2 &= O_p(Tr_T^4 p), \\ \sum_{i,t} R_{it2,3}^2 &= O_p(Tr_T^2 K^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\sum_{i,t} R_{it2}^2 = O_p(Tr_T^4(K^3 + p) + Tr_T^2 K^{-2}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

We then orthogonalize the parametric part with respect to the nonparametric part by writing

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}) - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) - R_{it})^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{0i}) - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i = \boldsymbol{\theta}_i + (\mathbf{\Pi}_i^T \mathbf{\Pi}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}_i^T \mathbf{V}_i \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{0i} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i} + (\mathbf{\Pi}_i^T \mathbf{\Pi}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}_i^T \mathbf{V}_i \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}$, $\mathbf{V}_i = (\mathbf{V}_{it}, \dots, \mathbf{V}_{iT})^T$, and \mathcal{M}_i is the one-to-one mapping that maps $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)$ to $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)$. Below we write $R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))$ as R_{it2} , $R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i))$ as \hat{R}_{it2} , and note $R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) = 0$. Then,

$$0 \geq \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\hat{\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2})^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i - R_{it1})^2 \\
= & \sum_{i,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^T - \mathbf{P}_{it}^T \mathbf{V}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) + \sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2}^2 \\
& - 2 \sum_{i,t} \left((\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) + \hat{R}_{it2} \right) (\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i - R_{it1}) \\
& + 2 \sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2} \cdot (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) \\
= & \sum_{i,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^T - \mathbf{P}_{it}^T \mathbf{V}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\
& - 2 \sum_{i,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) \epsilon_{it} \\
& - 2 \sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2} \epsilon_{it} \\
& + \sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2}^2 + 2 \sum_{i,t} \left((\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) + \hat{R}_{it2} \right) (\mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i + R_{it1}) \\
& + 2 \sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2} \cdot (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}). \tag{A.7}
\end{aligned}$$

The first term above is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^T - \mathbf{P}_{it}^T \mathbf{V}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\
= & T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T \mathbf{D}^{G_2} \mathbf{O}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{O}_2 \mathbf{D}^{G_2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{O}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_1^{G_2} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{J}_m^{G_2} \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{D}^{G_2})^{-1}$ is an $mp \times H_2$ orthonormal matrix, and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{ii} = \sum_t (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T / T$.

Let $\mathbf{C}_{ii} = E[(g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} - E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} | \mathbf{X}_{it} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}])^{\otimes 2}]$. Lemma 5 shows that $\max_i \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{ii} - \mathbf{C}_{ii}\|_{op} = o_p(1)$. Based on this, we have the first term in (A.7) is bounded below by $CT \|\mathbf{D}^{G_2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\|^2$.

Now consider the second term in (A.7). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) \epsilon_{it} \\
\leq & \|\mathbf{D}^{G_2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\| \cdot \left\| \sum_t \mathbf{O}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \mathbf{V}_1^T \mathbf{P}_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \mathbf{V}_m^T \mathbf{P}_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix} \right\|.
\end{aligned}$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_t \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \mathbf{V}_1^T \mathbf{P}_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \mathbf{V}_m^T \mathbf{P}_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \sum_t \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \Phi_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \Phi_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_1) \Phi_1 - \mathbf{P}_1 (\mathbf{V}_1 - \Phi_1))^T \epsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_m) \Phi_m - \mathbf{P}_m (\mathbf{V}_m - \Phi_m))^T \epsilon_m \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i = (\epsilon_{i1}, \dots, \epsilon_{iT})^T$.

The covariance matrix of $\begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \Phi_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \Phi_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix}$ is given by

$$\sum_{1 \leq t, t' \leq T} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11,|t-t'|} \sigma_{11,|t-t'|} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}_{1m,|t-t'|} \sigma_{1m,|t-t'|} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{C}_{m1,|t-t'|} \sigma_{m1,|t-t'|} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}_{mm,|t-t'|} \sigma_{mm,|t-t'|} \end{bmatrix},$$

with $\mathbf{C}_{ii',|t-t'|} = E[g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) g'_{0i'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't'}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i'}) (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} - E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} | \mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}]) (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i't'} - E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i't'} | \mathbf{X}_{i't'}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i'}])^T]$.

Using the geometric mixing rate, and similar to the proof of Lemma 4, it can be shown that the matrix above has eigenvalues of order $O_p(T)$.

Furthermore, we can bound the largest eigenvalue of

$$E \left[\begin{pmatrix} ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_1) \Phi_1 - \mathbf{P}_1 (\mathbf{V}_1 - \Phi_1))^T \epsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_m) \Phi_m - \mathbf{P}_m (\mathbf{V}_m - \Phi_m))^T \epsilon_m \end{pmatrix}^{\otimes 2} \right].$$

Denoting $\mathbf{E}_i = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_i) \Phi_i + \mathbf{P}_i (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)$, in Lemma 5 we have shown that $\max_i \|\mathbf{E}_i\|^2 = O_p(TK^{-4} + Kp \log T)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{E}_1^T \epsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{E}_m^T \epsilon_m \end{pmatrix}^{\otimes 2} \middle| \{\mathbf{X}_{it}\} \right] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{E}_1^T E[\epsilon_1 \epsilon_1^T] \mathbf{E}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{E}_1^T E[\epsilon_1 \epsilon_m^T] \mathbf{E}_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{E}_m^T E[\epsilon_m \epsilon_1^T] \mathbf{E}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{E}_m^T E[\epsilon_m \epsilon_m^T] \mathbf{E}_m \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Note $\|\mathbf{E}_i^T E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'}^T] \mathbf{E}_{i'}\|_{op} \leq \|E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'}^T]\|_{op} \|\mathbf{E}_i\| \|\mathbf{E}_{i'}\|$. Since for any $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \in R^T$, $\mathbf{u}^T E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_i^T] \mathbf{v} \leq (\mathbf{u}^T E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_i^T] \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}^T E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_i^T] \mathbf{v})/2$, and (by assumption (C2)) $\|E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_i^T]\|_{op} \leq M$, we have $\|E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'}^T]\|_{op} \leq M$ for all (i, i') . Furthermore, $\max_{i, i'} \|\mathbf{E}_i\| \|\mathbf{E}_{i'}\| = O_p(TK^{-4} + Kp \log T)$. Thus $\|\mathbf{E}_i^T E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_{i'}^T] \mathbf{E}_{i'}\|_{op} =$

$O_p(TK^{-4} + Kp\log T)$, uniformly over (i, i') . Now for $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m^\top)^\top \in R^{mp}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{v}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{E}_1^\top E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1 \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1^\top] \mathbf{E}_1 & \dots & \mathbf{E}_1^\top E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1 \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^\top] \mathbf{E}_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{E}_m^\top E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1^\top] \mathbf{E}_1 & \dots & \mathbf{E}_m^\top E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m^\top] \mathbf{E}_m \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ &= \sum_{i, i'} \mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{E}_i^\top E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i'}^\top] \mathbf{E}_{i'} \mathbf{v}_{i'} \\ &\leq \sum_{i, i'} \|\mathbf{v}_i\| \|\mathbf{E}_i^\top E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i'}^\top] \mathbf{E}_{i'}\|_{op} \|\mathbf{v}_{i'}\|, \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded by the largest eigenvalue of the $m \times m$ matrix with entries $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{E}_i^\top E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i'}^\top] \mathbf{E}_{i'})$, $i, i' = 1, \dots, m$. This matrix has eigenvalues bounded by $O_p(mTK^{-4} + mKp\log T) = o_p(T)$ by the Gershgorin circle theorem.

Using the trace inequality as in (A.3), we get

$$E \left[\left\| \sum_t \mathbf{O}_2^\top \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \mathbf{V}_1^\top \mathbf{P}_{1t}) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \mathbf{V}_m^\top \mathbf{P}_{mt}) \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{mt} \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2 \right] = O(H_2 T) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and thus the second term in (A.7) is $O_p(\sqrt{H_2 T} \|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\|)$. For the rest of the terms in (A.7), we have, using (A.6),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{it} \right)^2 = O_p(\text{Tr}_T^4(K^3 + p) + \text{Tr}_T^2 K^{-2}), \\ & \sum_{i,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^\top (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^\top (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^\top \mathbf{P}_{it}) \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i = \sum_i (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^\top (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^\top (\mathbf{V}_i - \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{V}_i) \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i = 0, \\ & \left(\sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2} R_{it1} \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i,t} R_{it1}^2 \right) = O_p((\text{Tr}_T^4(K^3 + p) + \text{Tr}_T^2 K^{-2}) mTK^{-4}), \\ & \left(\sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_i)^2 \right) = O_p((\text{Tr}_T^4(K^3 + p) + \text{Tr}_T^2 K^{-2}) \text{Tr}_T^2), \\ & \left(\sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^\top \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^\top \mathbf{P}_{it}) \right)^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2}^2 \right) \left\| (\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0))^\top \mathbf{O}_2^\top \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{V}_1^\top - \mathbf{V}_1^\top \mathbf{P}_1^\top \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{V}_m^\top - \mathbf{V}_m^\top \mathbf{P}_m^\top \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2 \\ & = O_p((\text{Tr}_T^4(K^3 + p) + \text{Tr}_T^2 K^{-2}) mpH_2). \end{aligned}$$

All these terms are order $o_p(1)$ by our assumptions. Finally, consider the term

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{i,t} R_{it1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^\top (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^\top (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^\top \mathbf{P}_{it}) \right)^2 \\ &= O_p(H_2/T) \left\| \sum_i \mathbf{R}_{i1}^\top (\mathbf{V}_i - \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{V}_i) \right\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{i1} = (R_{i11}, \dots, R_{iT1})^\top$. Again, using $\mathbf{V}_i = (\mathbf{V}_i - \boldsymbol{\Phi}_i) + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_i$,

$$\left(\sum_{i,t} R_{it1} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^\top (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^\top (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^\top \mathbf{P}_{it}) \right)^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= O_p(H_2/T) \left(\left\| \sum_i \mathbf{R}_{i1}^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_i) \Phi_i \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_i \mathbf{R}_{i1} \mathbf{P}_i (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i) \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_i \mathbf{R}_{i1} (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i) \right\|^2 \right) \\
&= O_p(H_2/T) \left(O_p(mTK^{-4} \cdot mTK^{-4}) + O_p(mTK^{-4} \cdot mKp \log T) + O_p(m^2 pTK^{-4}) \right) \\
&= o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Summarizing the bounds for different terms in (A.7), we get

$$\|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\| O_p(\sqrt{H_2/T}) + o_p(1/T) \leq 0$$

Completing the squares, we get

$$\left(\|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\| + O_p(\sqrt{H_2/T}) \right)^2 = O_p(H_2/T)$$

which in turn implies $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\| = \|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\| = O_p(\sqrt{H_2/T})$.

To get asymptotic normality, we similarly write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2})^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - R_{it1})^2 \\
&= \sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^T - \mathbf{P}_{it}^T \mathbf{V}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\
&\quad - 2 \sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) \epsilon_{it} \\
&\quad - 2 \sum_{i,t} R_{it2} \epsilon_{it} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i,t} R_{it2}^2 + 2 \sum_{i,t} \left((\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) + R_{it2} \right) (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + R_{it1}) \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i,t} R_{it2} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}). \tag{A.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 + \left(\sum_{i,t} (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^T - \mathbf{P}_{it}^T \mathbf{V}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i,t} (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) \epsilon_{it}$, which is actually the minimizer of the first two terms in (A.9) above. Then for any unit vector $\mathbf{a}_2 \in R^{H_2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{a}_2^T \mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\
&= T^{-1} \mathbf{a}_2^T \left(\mathbf{O}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{O}_2 \right)^{-1} \\
&\quad \sum_t \mathbf{O}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \mathbf{V}_1^T \mathbf{P}_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \mathbf{V}_m^T \mathbf{P}_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
b_1 &:= T^{-1} \mathbf{a}_2^T \left(\mathbf{O}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{O}_2 \right)^{-1} \\
&\quad \sum_t \mathbf{O}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \Phi_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \Phi_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix}, \\
b_2 &:= T^{-1} \mathbf{a}_2^T \left(\mathbf{O}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{O}_2 \right)^{-1} \\
&\quad \sum_t \mathbf{O}_2^T \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \Phi_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \Phi_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

As when showing the convergence rate, the covariance matrix of $\begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{V}_{1t} - \Phi_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{V}_{mt} - \Phi_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix}$ is given

by

$$\sum_{1 \leq t, t' \leq T} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11,|t-t'|} \sigma_{11,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}_{1m,|t-t'|} \sigma_{1m,|t-t'} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{C}_{m1,|t-t'|} \sigma_{m1,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}_{mm,|t-t'|} \sigma_{mm,|t-t'} \end{bmatrix},$$

with eigenvalues of order $O_p(T)$ and thus $|b_2| = O_p(\sqrt{1/T})$. Using the central limit theorem under mixing conditions, for example results in Bardet et al. (2008), we have

$$\sqrt{T} \nu_{2,T}^{-1/2} b_2 \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{2,T} &= \mathbf{a}_2^T (\mathbf{O}_2^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{O}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{O}_2^T \Sigma_2 \mathbf{O}_2 (\mathbf{O}_2^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{O}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{a}_2, \\
\mathbf{C} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}_{mm} \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Sigma_2 &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{1 \leq t, t' \leq T} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11,|t-t'|} \sigma_{11,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}_{1m,|t-t'|} \sigma_{1m,|t-t'} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{C}_{m1,|t-t'|} \sigma_{m1,|t-t'} & \cdots & \mathbf{C}_{mm,|t-t'|} \sigma_{mm,|t-t'} \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 5, $|b_1 - b_2| = o_p(\sqrt{1/T})$. We also have that

$$|\mathbf{a}_2^T \mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - b_1| = o_p(1/\sqrt{T}),$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} & E|\mathbf{a}_2^T \mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - b_1|^2 \\ &= O_p(T^{-2})\lambda_{\max} \left(E \left[\begin{pmatrix} ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_1)\boldsymbol{\Phi}_1 - \mathbf{P}_1(\mathbf{V}_1 - \boldsymbol{\Phi}_1))^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1 \\ \vdots \\ ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_m)\boldsymbol{\Phi}_m - \mathbf{P}_m(\mathbf{V}_m - \boldsymbol{\Phi}_m))^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m \end{pmatrix}^{\otimes 2} \right] \right) \\ &= o_p(1/T). \end{aligned}$$

Now we note that, as shown in proving convergence rate, uniformly for $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 \leq Cr_T^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & -2 \sum_{i,t} R_{it2} \epsilon_{it} \\ &+ \sum_{i,t} R_{it2}^2 + 2 \sum_{i,t} \left((\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)(\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) + R_{it2} \right) (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i + R_{it1}) \\ &+ 2 \sum_{i,t} R_{it2} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)(\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) = o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Letting

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) &:= \sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^T - \mathbf{P}_{it}^T \mathbf{V}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) \epsilon_{it}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\boldsymbol{\beta}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2})^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - R_{it1})^2 - Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \right| = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)))^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i)))^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - (Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) - Q(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})) \right| = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) - Q(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) = \sum_{i,t} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})(\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^T - \mathbf{P}_{it}^T \mathbf{V}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$, for any $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ with $\|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\boldsymbol{\eta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})\| = \delta/\sqrt{T}$ where $\delta > 0$ is a small number, $Q(\boldsymbol{\eta}) - Q(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$ is bounded away from zero.

This leads to that $\sum_{i,t}(\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)))^2$ is larger than $\sum_{i,t}(\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i)))^2$ with probability approaching one. Thus there is a local minimizer $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}})$ of $\sum_{i,t}(\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it})^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2})^T (\boldsymbol{\eta} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)))^2$ with $\|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}})\| = o_p(1/\sqrt{T})$. Thus $|\mathbf{a}_2^T \mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0) - \mathbf{a}_2^T \mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)| = o_p(1/\sqrt{T})$ which proved the theorem.

Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \mathbf{O}_2 \mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)$, $\mathbf{b}_2^T(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = \mathbf{b}_2^T \mathbf{O}_2 \mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)$ is asymptotically normal. That is, for any unit vector $\mathbf{b}_2 \in R^{mp}$,

$$\sqrt{T} \kappa_{2,T}^{-1/2} \mathbf{b}_2^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where

$$\kappa_{2,T} := \mathbf{b}_2^T \mathbf{O}_2 (\mathbf{O}_2^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{O}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{O}_2^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 \mathbf{O}_2 (\mathbf{O}_2^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{O}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{O}_2^T \mathbf{b}_2.$$

STEP 3. Proof of the convergence rate of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and its asymptotic normality.

To get convergence rate of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, like for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, we perform a projection, which is now the projection for the nonparametric part. Let $\mathbf{A}_{0i} := \arg \min_{\mathbf{A}} \|\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{A} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}\|^2$. Obviously, we have $\mathbf{A}_{0i} = E \left[g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T \right] \left(E \left[(g'_{0i}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T \right] \right)^{-1}$. In this part, Lemma 6 plays the role of assumption (C4) which was used in showing $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 = H_2/T$ previously.

Now we show $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 = O_p(H_1/T)$. The general strategy is similar to that used in showing $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 = O_p(H_2/T)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,t} (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}) - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - (\mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T - \mathbf{Q}_{it}^T \mathbf{\Pi}_i) (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}) - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T (\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - (\mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T - \mathbf{Q}_{it}^T \mathbf{\Pi}_i) (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}) - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T (\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i - (\mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{V}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{V}_i^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_i))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{Q}_{it}^T is the t -th row of $\mathbf{Q}_i = \mathbf{V}_i (\mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{V}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{V}_i^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i = \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i + (\mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{V}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{\Pi}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}_i$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0i} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0i} + (\mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{V}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{\Pi}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - (\mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T - \mathbf{Q}_{it}^T \mathbf{\Pi}_i) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}) - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - (\mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{V}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{V}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i))^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - (\mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{V}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{V}_i^T \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^T (\mathbf{\Pi}_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_i^T \mathbf{Q}_{it}) (\mathbf{\Pi}_{it}^T - \mathbf{Q}_{it}^T \mathbf{\Pi}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{i,t} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)^T (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^T (\mathbf{\Pi}_{it} - \mathbf{\Pi}_i^T \mathbf{Q}_{it}) \epsilon_{it} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2 \sum_{i,t} (\widehat{R}_{it2} - R_{it2}) \epsilon_{it} \\
& + \sum_{i,t} (\widehat{R}_{it2}^2 - R_{it2}^2) \\
& + 2 \sum_{i,t} \left((\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)^\top (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_{it}) + \widehat{R}_{it2} - R_{it2} \right) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0i}) + R_{it1}) \\
& + 2 \sum_{i,t} \widehat{R}_{it2} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)^\top (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_{it}), \tag{A.12}
\end{aligned}$$

where we write $R_{it2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - (\mathbf{V}_i^\top \mathbf{V}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{V}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i)$ as \widehat{R}_{it2} and $R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - (\mathbf{V}_i^\top \mathbf{V}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{V}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i})$ as R_{it2} . We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i,t} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)^\top (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_{it}) (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^\top - \mathbf{Q}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) \\
& = T (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)^\top \mathbf{D}^{G_1} \mathbf{O}_1^\top \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{O}_1 \mathbf{D}^{G_1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) \\
& \geq CT \|\mathbf{D}^{G_1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{O}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{J}_1^{G_1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{J}_m^{G_1} \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{D}^{G_1})^{-1}$ is an $mK \times H_1$ orthonormal matrix, and $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{ii} = \sum_t (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_{it}) (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_{it})^\top / T$, and the lower bound is obtained since $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{ii}$ can be shown to have eigenvalues uniformly bounded from zero, similar to Lemma 5 and using Lemma 6. Furthermore, as for (A.8), $\sum_{i,t} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)^\top (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_{it}) \epsilon_{it} = O_p(\sqrt{TH_1})$, and also the last four terms of (A.12) are $o_p(1)$, which leads to $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 = \|\mathbf{D}^{G_1} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)\|^2 = O_p(H_1/T)$.

Similarly, we can show the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ using basically the same arguments used in showing the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. Let

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_0 + \left(\sum_{i,t} (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_{it}) (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^\top - \mathbf{Q}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i) \mathbf{J}_i^{G_1} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i,t} (\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^\top (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^\top \mathbf{Q}_{it}) \epsilon_{it}.$$

Then for any unit vector $\mathbf{a}_1 \in R^{H_1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{a}_1^\top \mathbf{D}^{G_1} (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) \\
& = T^{-1} \mathbf{a}_1^\top \left(\mathbf{O}_1^\top \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{O}_2 \right)^{-1} \\
& \quad \sum_t \mathbf{O}_1^\top \begin{pmatrix} (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{1t} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_1^\top \mathbf{Q}_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{Q}_{mt} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_m^\top \mathbf{Q}_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

As before, it can be shown that the above is asymptotically equivalent to

$$T^{-1} \mathbf{a}_1^T \left(\mathbf{O}_1^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{D}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{O}_2 \right)^{-1} \sum_t \mathbf{O}_1^T \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{\Pi}_{1t} - \mathbf{\Psi}_{1t}) \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ (\mathbf{Q}_{mt} - \mathbf{\Psi}_{mt}) \epsilon_{mt} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{D}_{ii} = E[(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{A}_{0i} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it})^{\otimes 2}]$ and $\mathbf{\Psi}_{it} = g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{A}_{0i} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}$. This implies that

$$\sqrt{T} \nu_{1,T}^{-1/2} \mathbf{a}_1^T \mathbf{D}^{G_1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{1,T} &= \mathbf{a}_1^T (\mathbf{O}_1^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{O}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{O}_1^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{O}_1 (\mathbf{O}_1^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{O}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{a}_1, \\ \mathbf{D} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{11} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_{22} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{D}_{mm} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{1 \leq t, t' \leq T} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_{11,|t-t'|} \sigma_{11,|t-t'|} & \cdots & \mathbf{D}_{1m,|t-t'|} \sigma_{1m,|t-t'|} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{D}_{m1,|t-t'|} \sigma_{m1,|t-t'|} & \cdots & \mathbf{D}_{mm,|t-t'|} \sigma_{mm,|t-t'|} \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{D}_{ii',|t-t'|} &= E[(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{A}_{0i} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it})(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{i't'}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i'}) - g'_{0i'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't'}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i'}) \mathbf{A}_{0i'} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{i't'})^T]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \mathbf{O}_1 \mathbf{D}^{G_1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)$, $\mathbf{b}_1^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \mathbf{b}_1^T \mathbf{O}_1 \mathbf{D}^{G_1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)$ is asymptotically normal. That is, for any unit vector $\mathbf{b}_1 \in R^{mp}$,

$$\sqrt{T} \kappa_{1,T}^{-1/2} \mathbf{b}_1^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where

$$\kappa_{1,T} := \mathbf{b}_1^T \mathbf{O}_1 (\mathbf{O}_1^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{O}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{O}_1^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{O}_1 (\mathbf{O}_1^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{O}_1)^{-1} \mathbf{O}_1^T \mathbf{b}_1.$$

A.4 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

We now consider the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 as special cases of (A.11) and (A.13). Consider first Theorem 2, under the additional assumption that the true partition is used. As shown previously, the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ is $T^{-1} \mathbf{O}_2 \boldsymbol{\Theta}_2 \mathbf{O}_2^T$, where $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_2 = (\mathbf{O}_2^T \mathbf{C} \mathbf{O}_2)^{-1} \mathbf{O}_2^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2 \mathbf{O}_2 (\mathbf{O}_2^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{O}_2)^{-1}$. From our proof, it is easy to see that eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_2$ are bounded and bounded away from zero. By the definition of the $mp \times H_2$ matrix \mathbf{O}_2 , it is easy to see that its row corresponding

to β_{ij} , say denoted by $\mathbf{O}_{2(ij)}^T$, has a single nonzero entry $1/\sqrt{m_{ij}}$. Let $\mathbf{e}_{ij} = \sqrt{m_{ij}}\mathbf{O}_{2(ij)}$, which is a unit vector, then the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\beta}_{ij} - \beta_{0ij}$ is $(m_{ij}T)^{-1}\mathbf{e}_{ij}^T\Theta_2\mathbf{e}_{ij}$.

The asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}$ is $T^{-1}\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1}(\mathbf{D}^{G_1})^{-1}\overline{\Theta}_1(\mathbf{D}^{G_1})^{-1}(\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1})^T$, where $\overline{\Theta}_1 = (\mathbf{O}_1^T\mathbf{D}\mathbf{O}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{O}_1^T\Sigma_1\mathbf{O}_1(\mathbf{O}_1^T\mathbf{C}\mathbf{O}_1)^{-1}$ with eigenvalues bounded and bounded away from zero. By definition of $\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1}$ and \mathbf{D}^{G_1} , it can be seen that each row of the $K \times H_1$ matrix $\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1}(\mathbf{D}^{G_1})^{-1}$ has a single nonzero entry $1/\sqrt{m_i}$ and thus if we define $\mathbf{K}_i = \sqrt{m_i}\mathbf{J}_i^{G_1}(\mathbf{D}^{G_1})^{-1}$, it is easy to directly verify that $\mathbf{K}_i^T\mathbf{v}$ is bounded and bounded away from zero and infinity for any unit vector \mathbf{v} . Also, we have $\|\mathbf{B}(x)\| \asymp K$. Thus the asymptotic variance of $\mathbf{B}^T(x)\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i - \mathbf{B}^T(x)\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}$ can be written as $\frac{K}{m_i T}\mathbf{b}^T(x)\Theta_1^T\mathbf{b}(x)$, if we define $\mathbf{b}(x) = \mathbf{K}_i^T\mathbf{B}(x)/\|\mathbf{K}_i^T\mathbf{B}(x)\|$, and $\Theta_1 = \overline{\Theta}_1\|\mathbf{K}_i^T\mathbf{B}(x)\|^2/K$.

For Theorem 1, since the result is standard, and also is a special case of Theorem 2, we omit the repetition of arguments above. The quantities $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{ij}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(x)$, $\tilde{\Theta}_1$ and $\tilde{\Theta}_2$ are defined as above based on the trivial structure in which each single parameter forms its own group in the partition.

The proof of Theorem 2 would be complete if we can establish consistency of homogeneity pursuit based on change point detection. That is, we need to show that the true partition can be identified with probability approaching one. Again for clarity the proof of this is split into three steps.

STEP 1. First consider the rate of $|\widehat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01}|$.

The proof is similar as for the rates of $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|$, with more complicated notations. Write $\mathbf{D}^{G_2} = \text{diag}(D_1, \mathbf{D}_2)$ where $D_1 = \sqrt{|G_{2,1}|}$ is the the (1, 1)-entry of \mathbf{D}^{G_2} , write $\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2} = (\mathbf{J}_{i1}, \mathbf{J}_{i2})$ with \mathbf{J}_{i1} the first column of $\mathbf{J}_i^{G_2}$. Also write $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \boldsymbol{\eta}_2^T)^T$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,t} (y_{it} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T (\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0i}) - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T \mathbf{J}_{i2} \mathbf{D}_2^{-1} \mathbf{D}_2 (\boldsymbol{\eta}_2 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{02}) - \mathbf{V}_{it}^T \mathbf{J}_{i1} D_1^{-1} D_1 (\eta_1 - \eta_{01}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{it}^T (\boldsymbol{\delta}_i - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0i}) - (U_{it} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{it}^T \mathbf{U}_i) D_1 (\eta_1 - \eta_{01}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\delta}_i, \eta_1))^2 \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{U}_i is T -vector with entries $U_{it} = \mathbf{V}_{it}^T \mathbf{J}_{i1} / D_1$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{it} = (\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{it}^T, \mathbf{V}_{it}^T \mathbf{J}_{i2} \mathbf{D}_2^{-1})^T$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i = (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{i1}, \dots, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{iT})^T$, $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_i = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i)^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i^T$ with rows $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{it}^T = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{it} (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i)^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i^T$, $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\theta} \\ \mathbf{D}_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}_2 \end{pmatrix} + (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i)^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i^T \mathbf{U}_i D_1 \eta_1$

and $\boldsymbol{\delta}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \\ \mathbf{D}_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}_{02} \end{pmatrix} + (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i)^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_i^T \mathbf{U}_i D_1 \eta_{01}$. Finally, (with abuse of notation) $\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\delta}_i, \eta_1)$ denotes the one-to-one mapping from parameterization $(\boldsymbol{\delta}_i, \eta_1)$ to the parametrization $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \sum_{i,t} \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{it}^T (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_i - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0i}) - (U_{it} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{it}^T \mathbf{U}_i) D_1 (\widehat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_i, \widehat{\eta}_1))^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,t} (\epsilon_{it} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Pi}}_{it}^T (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_i - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0i}) - R_{it1} - R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_i, \eta_{01}))^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i,t} (D_1(\hat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01}))^2 (U_{it} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_i^T \mathbf{U}_i)^2 \\
&\quad - 2 \sum_{i,t} D_1(\hat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01}) (U_{it} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_i^T \mathbf{U}_i) \epsilon_{it} \\
&\quad - 2 \sum_{i,t} (\hat{R}_{it2} - R_{it2}) \epsilon_{it} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i,t} (\hat{R}_{it2}^2 - R_{it2}^2) \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i,t} \left(D_1(\hat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01}) (U_{it} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_i^T \mathbf{U}_i) + \hat{R}_{it2} - R_{it2} \right) (\tilde{\mathbf{\Pi}}_{it}^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_i - \boldsymbol{\delta}_{0i}) + R_{it1}) \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i,t} \hat{R}_{it2} D_1(\hat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01}) (U_{it} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_i^T \mathbf{U}_i) \tag{A.14}
\end{aligned}$$

with $\hat{R}_{it2} = R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_i, \hat{\eta}_1))$ and $R_{it2} = R_{it2}(\mathcal{M}_i(\boldsymbol{\delta}_i, \eta_{01}))$. The convergence rate $(\hat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01})^2 = O_p(1/|D_1^2 T|)$ is obtained by that the first term in (A.14) is bounded below by $CTD_1^2(\hat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01})^2$, the second term is $O_p(\sqrt{T})|D_1(\hat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01})|$ while the rest are $o_p(1)$. Arguments for showing these are the same as those used in showing the rates of $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|$ and $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|$, and thus the details are omitted.

STEP 2. Now consider the convergence rate of $\|\mathbf{D}^{G_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_0)\|_\infty$ and $\|\mathbf{D}^{G_1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)\|_\infty$.

In the study of $|\hat{\eta}_1 - \eta_{01}|$ above, we do not make explicit that various quantities such as U_{it} , \mathbf{P}_i depends on which component of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ we are focusing on. In this section, we use subscript (j) , $j = 1, \dots, H_2$ to make this dependence explicit.

To get convergence rate in infinity norm, we only need to get uniform bound for the terms in (A.14). $\sum_{i,t} (U_{it(j)} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{i(j)}^T \mathbf{U}_{i(j)})^2$ is (uniformly over different components j of η_i) lower bounded by CT using Lemma 7 and the arguments used in Lemmas 1 and 6.

For the second term in (A.14), using Theorem 2.19 of Fan and Yao (2003), (assuming ϵ_{it} is subGaussian)

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq H_2} \sum_t (U_{it(j)} - \psi_{it(j)}) \epsilon_{it} = O_p(\log(Tm)\sqrt{T}).$$

Using (B.8)-(B.10),

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq H_2} \sum_t (\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{i(j)}^T \mathbf{U}_{i(j)} - \psi_{it(j)}) \epsilon_{it} = O_p(\sqrt{T}).$$

The rest terms in (A.14) are uniformly $o_p(1)$ as shown before. These calculations combined implies and convergence rate in infinity norm.

That $\|\mathbf{D}^{G_1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_0)\|_\infty^2 = O_p(\log(Tm)/T)$ can be derived in the same way and thus omitted.

STEP 3. Finally we show the consistency of change point detection.

We use sequence $b_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq b_{(n)}$ ($n = mp$) for illustration, with estimated change points $\hat{k}_0 = 0 < \hat{k}_1 < \dots < \hat{k}_{\hat{H}_2} = n$. The true ordered sequence of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is $\beta_{0(1)} \leq \dots \leq \beta_{0(n)}$ with change points k_h , $h = 0, \dots, H_2$. Let $\gamma_2 = \min_{2 \leq h \leq H_2} |\beta_{0(k_{h+1})} - \beta_{0(k_h)}|$ be the minimum jump size. The sup-norm convergence results established above, when specializing to the estimator in stage 1,

imply that $\|\tilde{\beta} - \beta_0\|_\infty = O_p(a_T)$ where $a_T = \sqrt{\log(Tm)/T}$. On the event $\{\|\tilde{\beta} - \beta_0\|_\infty \leq Ca_T\}$. It is easy to see that

$$\max_{s-1 < k < e} |\Delta_{s,e}(k) - \Delta_{s,e}^0(k)| \leq \sqrt{na_T}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where $\Delta_{s,e}^0(k) = \sqrt{\frac{(e-k)(k-s+1)}{e-s+1}} \left| \frac{\sum_{l=k+1}^e \beta_{0(l)}}{e-k} - \frac{\sum_{l=s}^k \beta_{0(l)}}{k-s+1} \right|$.

Now suppose $s-1$ and e are both change points and there is at least one change point inside $(s-1, e)$. Let $\hat{k} = \arg \max_{s-1 < k < e} \Delta_{s,e}(k)$ and $k_0 = \arg \max_{s-1 < k < e} \Delta_{s,e}^0(k)$. We prove consistency by way of contradiction. Suppose \hat{k} is not one of the true change points. Then there exists some h such that $\hat{k} \in \{k_h + 1, \dots, k_{h+1} - 1\}$. From Lemma 2.2 of Venkatraman (1992), $\Delta_{s,e}^0(k)$ is either monotone, or decreasing and then increasing on this interval, and $\max\{\Delta_{s,e}^0(k_h), \Delta_{s,e}^0(k_{h+1})\} > \Delta_{s,e}^0(\hat{k})$. Assume now $\Delta_{s,e}^0(k)$ is locally decreasing at \hat{k} (the other case would be similar). Then we have $\Delta_{s,e}^0(k_h) > \Delta_{s,e}^0(\hat{k})$ and $\Delta_{s,e}^0(k_h)$ is locally decreasing on the right side of k_h . Then, arguing exactly as in Lemma 2.2 of Cho and Fryzlewicz (2012), we have $\Delta_{s,e}^0(k_h) - \Delta_{s,e}^0(k_h + 1) > C\gamma_2/\sqrt{n}$. This in turn leads to $\Delta_{s,e}^0(k_0) - \Delta_{s,e}^0(\hat{k}) > C\gamma_2/\sqrt{n}$. Since we assumed $\sqrt{na_T} = o(\gamma_2/\sqrt{n})$, this would lead to $\Delta_{s,e}(k_0) > \Delta_{s,e}(\hat{k})$ by (A.15), a contradiction by the definition of \hat{k} . Also, in this case, it is easy to see that $\max_{s-1 < k < e} \Delta_{s,e}(k) \geq \max_{s-1 < k < e} \Delta_{s,e}^0(k) - \sqrt{na_T} \geq C\gamma_2 - \sqrt{na_T} > \delta_2$.

Now suppose still s, e are both change points but there are no other change point inside (s, e) . In this case, using (A.15), it is easy to see that $\max_{s-1 < k < e} \Delta_{s,e}(k) \leq \sqrt{na_T}$.

Since we refrain from further partitioning the interval (s, e) if and only if $\max_{s-1 < k < e} \Delta_{s,e}(k) < \delta_2$ with $na_T \ll \delta_2 \ll \gamma_2$, we see that the algorithm consistently identifies exactly the true change points in β_0 .

The proof for change point detection in θ is the same, and the proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

A.5 Proof of Theorem 3

For the first statement, we just need to note that $\bar{\beta}$ is the minimizer of

$$\min_{\mathbf{a}} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\beta_i - \mathbf{a}\|^2,$$

and all $\check{\beta}_i$ are the same, thus

$$\frac{1}{mp} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\check{\beta}_i - \beta_i\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{mp} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\beta_i - \bar{\beta}\|^2 \geq c.$$

Similarly we can show the second statement.

Appendix B. Proof of Lemmas

Define matrices

$$\mathbf{A}_{i'i'} = E \left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \beta_i) \\ g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \beta_i) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}^\top(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \beta_i) & g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \beta_i) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^\top \end{pmatrix} \right], 1 \leq i, i' \leq m.$$

Lemma 1 *The eigenvalues of \mathbf{A}_{ii} are bounded and bounded away from zero. The largest singular value (the operator norm) of $\mathbf{A}_{i'}$, $i \neq i'$, is bounded. The bounds do not depend on (i, i') .*

Proof of Lemma 1. By the smoothness assumption (C3), there exists $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i \in R^{p \times K}$, with rows $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{ij}^T, j = 1, \dots, p$, such that

$$|g'_{0i}(x)E[X_{it,j}|\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i = x] - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{ij}^T\mathbf{B}(x)| \leq CK^{-2}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We show that the operator norm of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$ is bounded. If p is fixed, since $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{ij}\| \asymp \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{ij}^T\mathbf{B}(\cdot)\|_{L_2}$ is bounded, we see the operator norm of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$ is bounded since it is smaller than the operator norm. In general, we use the following more complicated arguments. Since $E[\mathbf{X}_{it}\mathbf{X}_{it}^T]$ has bounded eigenvalues, so does $\text{Var}(\mathbf{X}_{it})$ (the covariance matrix of \mathbf{X}_{it}) and $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{it})^{\otimes 2}$ where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{it} = E[\mathbf{X}_{it}]$. This implies $\text{Var}(E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}|\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i])$ has bounded eigenvalues since $\text{Var}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}) = \text{Var}(E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}|\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i]) + E[\text{Var}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}|\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)]$. This fact together with that $(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{it})^{\otimes 2}$ has bounded eigenvalues implies $E[(E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}|\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i])^{\otimes 2}]$ has bounded eigenvalues. Now using (B.1), $E[\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i^T]$ has bounded eigenvalues (if $p/K^{d'} \rightarrow 0$). Since $E[\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i^T] = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\mathbf{G}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i^T$ for $\mathbf{G} = E[\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)]$ which has eigenvalues bounded and bounded away from zero by assumption (C1). We have that the operator norm of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\mathbf{G}^{1/2}$ is bounded, which in turn implies the operator norm of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$ is bounded.

Then we show that the operator norm of

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

is bounded. This is easily shown by definition, since

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{pmatrix} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix} \right\| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + 2(\|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\|_{op}^2\|\mathbf{u}\|^2) \leq C(\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{v}\|^2) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the inverse of (B.2) is $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix}$ which also has bounded operator norm.

Premultiplying \mathbf{A}_{ii} by (B.2) and post-multiply \mathbf{A}_{ii} by the transpose of (B.2), we get the matrix

$$E \left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \\ g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) & g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T - \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i^T \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

The operator norm for the difference between the above and

$$E \left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \\ g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} - E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}|\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i]) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) & g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T - E[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T|\mathbf{X}_{it}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_i]) \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

is (using operator norm is bounded by the maximum row sum of absolute values of entries) $CK^{-2}(\sqrt{K} + p) = o(1)$. The displayed matrix above is block diagonal and the eigenvalues of both blocks are bounded and bounded away from zero by assumptions (C1) and (C4). This proves the first statement of the lemma.

For $\mathbf{A}_{ii'}$ with $i \neq i'$, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is easy to see that for any $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in R^{K+p}$, $\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{A}_{ii'} \mathbf{v} \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{A}_{ii'} \mathbf{u}} \sqrt{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{A}_{ii'} \mathbf{v}}$ which leads to the desired result. \square

Let

$$\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{ii'} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \\ g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^\top \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}^\top(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) & g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^\top \end{pmatrix} \right], 1 \leq i, i' \leq m.$$

Lemma 2 *The eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{ii}$ are bounded and bounded away from zero, and the largest singular value (the operator norm) of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{ii'}$, $i \neq i'$, is bounded, with probability approaching one, uniformly over (i, i') and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$.*

Proof of Lemma 2. For any $1 \leq k, k' \leq K$ and $1 \leq i, i' \leq m$, we have

$$B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) \leq K,$$

and

$$E[(B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}))^2] \leq KE[(B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i))^2] \leq CK.$$

Thus

$$E[(B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}))^r] \leq CK^{r-2} \cdot K, \quad r = 3, 4, \dots$$

Using Theorem 2.19 of Fan and Yao (2003) (setting $q = T/(C_1 \log T)$ in that theorem with large enough C_1), for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left(\left| T^{-1} \sum_t B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) - E[B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'})] \right| > \epsilon \right) \\ & \leq C(1 + \log T + \mu(\epsilon)) \exp\left\{-C \frac{T}{\log T} \mu(\epsilon)\right\} + CT(1 + K^{C_2}/\epsilon)T^{-C_3}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu(\epsilon) = \epsilon^2/(K + K\epsilon)$, C_2 is some positive constant, and the constant C_3 can be arbitrarily large as long as one chooses C_1 large. Setting $\epsilon = \delta/K$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\max_{k, k', i, i'} \left| T^{-1} \sum_t B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) - E[B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'})] \right| > \delta/K) \\ & = o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

Similarly

$$E \left[|g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) g'_{0i'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) X_{it,j} X_{it,j'}|^r \right] \leq r! C^{r-2},$$

implies

$$P \left(\left| T^{-1} \sum_t g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) g'_{0i'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) X_{it,j} X_{it,j'} - E[g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) g'_{0i'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) X_{it,j} X_{it,j'}] \right| > \epsilon \right)$$

$$\leq C(1 + \log T + \mu(\epsilon)) \exp\left\{-C \frac{T}{\log T} \mu(\epsilon)\right\} + CT(1 + C/\epsilon)T^{-C_3},$$

where $\mu(\epsilon) = \epsilon^2/(1 + \epsilon)$. Setting $\epsilon = \delta/p$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\max_{j,j',i,i'} \left| T^{-1} \sum_t g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) g'_{0i'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) X_{it,j} X_{it,j'} - E[g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) g'_{0i'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) X_{it,j} X_{it,j'}] \right| > \delta/p \right) \\ &= o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

Thus $\max_{i,i'} \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{ii'} - \mathbf{A}_{ii'}\|_{op} = o_p(1)$ and then Lemma 1 implies the result for any fixed $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

It is easy to extend the results to obtain uniformity over $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$. Choosing a T^{-a} -covering, say \mathcal{N}_i of $\{\boldsymbol{\beta}_i : \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}\| \leq b\}$ for some constant a large enough. That is, for any $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ there exists a $\boldsymbol{\beta}'_i \in \mathcal{N}_i$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}'_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}_i\| < n^{-a}$. The size of \mathcal{N}_i is bounded by $\exp\{Cp \log(T)\}$ by Lemma 2.5 of van der Geer (2000).

To modify (B.3) to be uniform over $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, note that by Lipschitz continuity, it is easy to see that we have

$$\left| T^{-1} \sum_t B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) - T^{-1} \sum_t B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}'_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}'_{i'}) \right|' \leq T^{-a'} \tag{B.5}$$

and

$$|E[B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'})] - E[B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}'_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}'_{i'})]| \leq T^{-a'}, \tag{B.6}$$

for some $a' > 0$ (obviously we can make a' arbitrarily large by setting a to be large).

Using Theorem 2.19 of Fan and Yao (2003) (setting now $q = T^{1-\delta}/\log T$), for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\left| T^{-1} \sum_t B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) - E[B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'})] \right| > \epsilon \right) \\ & \leq C(1 + T^\delta + \mu(\epsilon)) \exp\{-CT^{1-\delta} \mu(\epsilon)\} + CT(1 + K^{C_2}/\epsilon) \exp\{-CT^{-\delta}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu(\epsilon) = \epsilon^2/(K + K\epsilon)$. By union bound, we can still have

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\max_{k,k',i,i',\boldsymbol{\beta}_i \in \mathcal{N}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'} \in \mathcal{N}_{i'}} \left| T^{-1} \sum_t B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'}) - E[B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) B_{k'}(\mathbf{X}_{i't}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i'})] \right| > \delta/K \right) \\ &= o(1). \end{aligned}$$

The uniformity of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i \in \mathcal{N}_i$ imply the uniformity of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}$ by (B.5) and (B.6).

Similarly we can modify (B.4) to be uniform over $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ if $p^3(\log T)^2 \log(pm)/T \rightarrow 0$, which finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 3 *Eigenvalues of $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{ii'}$ are bounded and bounded away from zero, with probability approaching one, uniformly over (i, i') and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.*

Proof of Lemma 3. First, by Lemma 2, the eigenvalues of $(1/T) \sum_t \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \mathbf{B}^T(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_i)$ are bounded and bounded away from zero.

Since $\|\beta_i - \beta_{0i}\| = O(r_T)$ and $\|\beta_i^* - \beta_{0i}\| = O(r_T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\theta_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i^*) \right)^2 X_{it,j} X_{it,j} - (g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i))^2 X_{it,j} X_{it,j'} \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\left(\theta_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i^*) \right)^2 - \left(\theta_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i) \right)^2 \right) X_{it,j} X_{it,j'} + \left(\left(\theta_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i^*) \right)^2 - (g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i))^2 \right) X_{it,j} X_{it,j'} \\ &= O_p(r_T \sqrt{p} + K^{-2}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \theta_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i^*) X_{it,j} B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i) - g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i) X_{it,j} B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\theta_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i) - g_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i)) X_{it,j} B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i) + (\theta_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i^*) - \theta_{0i}^T \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i)) X_{it,j} B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \beta_i) \\ &= O_p((K^{-2} + r_T \sqrt{p})/K). \end{aligned}$$

Thus if $r_T \sqrt{p^3} = o(1)$ and $p = o(K^d)$, we have $\|\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{ii} - \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{ii}\|_{op} = o_p(1)$ which proves the lemma.

□

Lemma 4 *Eigenvalues of*

$$\sum_{t,t'} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11,|t-t'|\sigma_{11,|t-t'|}} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{1m,|t-t'|\sigma_{1m,|t-t'|}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{m1,|t-t'|\sigma_{m1,|t-t'|}} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{mm,|t-t'|\sigma_{mm,|t-t'|}} \end{bmatrix}$$

are bounded by CT for some constant C .

Proof of Lemma 4. By Lemma 1, and similar to the proof of Lemma 3, $\max_i \|\mathbf{A}_{ii,0}\|_{op}$ is bounded. Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is easy to show $\|\mathbf{A}_{ii',|t-t'}\|_{op} \leq (\|\mathbf{A}_{ii,0}\|_{op} + \|\mathbf{A}_{i'i',0}\|_{op})/2$ and thus $\max_{i,i',t,t'} \|\mathbf{A}_{ii',|t-t'}\|_{op}$ is also bounded.

Let $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m^T)^T \in R^{m(K+p)}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t,t'} \mathbf{v}^T \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11,|t-t'|\sigma_{11,|t-t'|}} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{1m,|t-t'|\sigma_{1m,|t-t'|}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{m1,|t-t'|\sigma_{m1,|t-t'|}} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{mm,|t-t'|\sigma_{mm,|t-t'|}} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{v} \\ &= \sum_{t,t'} \sum_{i,i'} \sigma_{ii',|t-t'|} \mathbf{v}_i^T \mathbf{A}_{ii',|t-t'|} \mathbf{v}_{i'} \\ &= T \sum_{l=1}^{T-1} \sum_{i,i'} (1-l/T) \sigma_{ii',l} \mathbf{v}_i^T \mathbf{A}_{ii',l} \mathbf{v}_{i'} \\ &\leq T \sum_{l=1}^{T-1} \sum_{i,i'} (1-l/T) |\sigma_{ii',l}| \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_i\| \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i'}\| \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}_{ii',l}) \\ &\leq CT \sum_{i,i'} \tau_{ii'} \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_i\| \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_{i'}\| \\ &\leq CT \lambda_{\max}(\{\tau_{ii'}\}_{i,i'=1}^m) \leq CT, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $\lambda_{\max}(\{\tau_{ii'}\}_{i,i'=1}^m)$ is bounded, by assumption (C2) and the Gershgorin circle theorem. \square

Lemma 5 $\max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \|\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{ii} - \mathbf{C}_{ii}\|_{op} = o_p(1)$.

Proof of Lemma 5. Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{ii} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 (\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{it} - E[\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{it} | \mathbf{X}_{it} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}])^{\otimes 2}$. Also let $\Phi_{it} = g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) E[\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{it} | \mathbf{X}_{it} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}]$, $\Phi_i = (\Phi_{i1}, \dots, \Phi_{iT})^T$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{ii} - \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{ii} \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_t (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it}^T - \mathbf{P}_{it}^T \mathbf{V}_i) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_t (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \Phi_{it}) (\mathbf{V}_{it} - \Phi_{it})^T \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{V}_i^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_i) \mathbf{V}_i - \frac{1}{T} (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)^T (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i). \end{aligned}$$

Writing $\mathbf{V}_i = (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i) + \Phi_i$, the above is equal to

$$\frac{1}{T} (\Phi_i^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_i) \Phi_i + (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_i) \Phi_i + \Phi_i (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_i) (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i) - (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)^T \mathbf{P}_i (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Since $g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) E[\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{it} | \mathbf{X}_{it} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}]$ is a d' -smooth function of $\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}$, we have

$$\|(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_i) \Phi_i\| \leq C \sqrt{T} K^{-2}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

We also have trivially

$$\max_i \|\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i\| = O_p(\sqrt{Tp}). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Now consider $\|\mathbf{P}_i (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)\|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{P}_i (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)\| \\ &= \|\Pi_i (\Pi_i^T \Pi_i)^{-1} \Pi_i^T (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)\| \\ &\leq \|\Pi_i (\Pi_i^T \Pi_i)^{-1}\|_{op} \|\Pi_i^T (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)\|, \end{aligned}$$

and $\max_i \|\Pi_i (\Pi_i^T \Pi_i)^{-1}\|_{op}^2 = \max_i \|(\Pi_i^T \Pi_i)^{-1}\|_{op} = O_p(1/T)$ as proved in Lemma 2. For the term $\|\Pi_i^T (\mathbf{V}_i - \Phi_i)\|$, we can deal with it similar to (B.3). First note that $B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})(X_{it,j} - \phi_{it,j})$ has mean zero ($\phi_{it,j}$ is the j -th component of Φ_{it} , $j = 1, \dots, p$). Since $X_{it,j}$ is bounded, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})(X_{it,j} - \phi_{it,j}) \leq C \sqrt{K} \\ & E[(B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})(X_{it,j} - \phi_{it,j}))^2] \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

and applying Theorem 2.19 of Fan and Yao (2003),

$$\begin{aligned} & P(B_k(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})(X_{it,j} - \phi_{it,j}) > T\epsilon) \\ &\leq C(1 + \log T + \mu(\epsilon)) \exp\{-C \frac{T}{\log T} \mu(\epsilon)\} + CT(1 + 1/\epsilon) T^{-C_2} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu(\epsilon) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{\sqrt{K\epsilon+1}}$. Setting $\epsilon = \sqrt{\log T/T}$, and taking union bound over (i, j, k) , we can obtain

$$\max_i \|\boldsymbol{\Pi}_i^T(\mathbf{V}_i - \boldsymbol{\Phi}_i)\| = O_p(\sqrt{TK \text{plog} T}).$$

Thus

$$\|\mathbf{P}_i(\mathbf{V}_i - \boldsymbol{\Phi}_i)\| = o_p(\sqrt{T}) \quad \text{if } K \text{plog} T/T \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Then using (B.8)-(B.10), (B.7) is $o_p(1)$. Finally, using the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 2, we get $\max_i \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{ii} - \mathbf{C}_{ii}\|_{op} = o_p(1)$. \square

Lemma 6 *Eigenvalues of $E[(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{A}_{0i} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it})(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{A}_{0i} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it})^T]$ are bounded and bounded away from zero, uniformly over i .*

The proof is based on the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 7 *Suppose a positive definite matrix $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^T & \mathbf{C} \end{pmatrix}$ has all eigenvalues inside the interval $[c, C]$ for some $0 < c < C < \infty$. Then all eigenvalues of $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B}$ are also inside the interval $[c, C]$.*

Proof of Lemma 7. Obviously eigenvalues of $\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B}$ are no larger than that of \mathbf{C} , which is in turn bounded by C . Next, we have the identity

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^T & \mathbf{C} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0}^T & \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus for any vector \mathbf{b} with dimension same as that of \mathbf{C} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{b}^T (\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{b} \\ &= (\mathbf{0}^T, \mathbf{b}^T) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0}^T & \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (\mathbf{0}^T, \mathbf{b}^T) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^T & \mathbf{C} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & -\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (-\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{A}^{-1}, \mathbf{b}^T) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{B}^T & \mathbf{C} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{b} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 c, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 6. Since we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E[(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{A}_{0i} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it})(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) - g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{A}_{0i} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it})^T] \\ &= E[(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{B}^T (\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})) \\ &\quad - E[g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T] \left(E[(g'_{0i}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}))^2 \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it}^T] \right)^{-1} E[g'_{0i}(\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i}) \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{it} \mathbf{B}^T (\mathbf{X}_{it}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0i})], \end{aligned}$$

the lemma follows from Lemma 1 and Lemma 7. \square

References

- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions, *Econometrica* **71**(1): 135–171.
- Bardet, J.-M., Doukhan, P., Lang, G. and Ragache, N. (2008). Dependent lindeberg central limit theorem and some applications, *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics* **12**: 154–172.
- Bondell, H. D. and Reich, B. J. (2008). Simultaneous regression shrinkage, variable selection, and supervised clustering of predictors with OSCAR, *Biometrics* **64**(1): 115–123.
- Carroll, R. J., Fan, J., Gijbels, I. and Wand, M. P. (1997). Generalized partially linear single-index models, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **92**: 477–489.
- Cho, H. and Fryzlewicz, P. (2012). Multiscale and multilevel technique for consistent segmentation of nonstationary time series, *Statistica Sinica* **22**(1): 207–229.
- Fan, J. and Yao, Q. (2003). *Nonlinear time series: nonparametric and parametric methods*, Springer Verlag.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., Hfling, H. and Tibshirani, R. (2007). Pathwise coordinate optimization, *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **1**(2): 302–332.
- Guo, S., Box, J. L. and Zhang, W. (2016). A dynamic structure for high dimensional covariance matrices and its application in portfolio allocation, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112** (517): 235–253.
- Härdle, W. and Stoker, T. M. (1989). Investigating smooth multiple regression by the method of average derivatives, *Journal of the American statistical Association* **84**(408): 986–995.
- Hsiao, C. (2014). *Analysis of panel data*, Cambridge university press.
- James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An Introduction to Statistical Learning with Application in R*, Springer.
- Jiang, Q., Wang, H., Xia, Y. and Jiang, G. (2013). On a principal varying coefficient model, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **108**(501): 228–236.
- Ke, Y., Li, J. and Zhang, W. (2016). Structure identification in panel data analysis, *The Annals of Statistics* **44**(3): 1193–1233.
- Ke, Z. T., Fan, J. and Wu, Y. (2015). Homogeneity pursuit, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**(509): 175–194.
- Mirsky, L. (1975). A trace inequality of John von Neumann, *Monatshefte für Mathematik* **79**(4): 303–306.

- Peng, H. and Huang, T. (2011). Penalized least squares for single index models, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **141**(4): 1362–1379.
- Tibshirani, R., Saunders, M., Rosset, S., Zhu, J. and Knight, K. (2005). Sparsity and smoothness via the fused lasso, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B-Statistical Methodology* **67**: 91–108.
- van der Geer, S. A. (2000). *Empirical Processes in M-Estimation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Venkatraman, E. S. (1992). *Consistency results in multiple change-point problems*, Thesis, Stanford University.
- Vogt, M. and Linton, O. B. (2015). Classification of nonparametric regression functions in heterogeneous panels, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B-Methodological* **to appear**.
- Wang, L. and Yang, L. (2009). Spline estimation of single-index models, *Statistica Sinica* **19**(2): 765–783.
- Xia, Y. (2008). A multiple-index model and dimension reduction, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **103**(484): 1631–1640.
- Yu, Y. and Ruppert, D. (2002). Penalized spline estimation for partially linear single-index models, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **97**(460): 1042–1054.
- Zhu, L., Miao, B. and Peng, H. (2012). On sliced inverse regression with high-dimensional covariates, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **101**(474): 630–643.
- Zhu, L. and Xue, L. (2006). Empirical likelihood confidence regions in a partially linear single-index model, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **68**(3): 549–570.