

On the asymptotic distribution of model averaging based on information criterion

Miaomiao Wang^{1,2,3,*}, Xinyu Zhang², Alan T.K. Wan⁴, Guohua Zou⁵

¹*School of Chinese Pharmacy, Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing, China.*

²*Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.*

³*University of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.*

⁴*Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Kowloon, Hong Kong.*

⁵*School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing, China.*

SUMMARY

Smoothed AIC (S-AIC) and Smoothed BIC (S-BIC) are very widely used in model averaging and are very easily to implement. Especially, the optimal model averaging method MMA and JMA have only been well developed in linear models. Only by modifying, they can be applied to other models. But S-AIC and S-BIC can be used in all situations where AIC and BIC can be calculated. In this paper, we study the asymptotic behavior of two commonly used model averaging estimators, the S-AIC and S-BIC estimators, under the standard asymptotic with general fixed parameter setup. In addition, the resulting coverage probability in Buckland et al. (1997) is not studied accurately, but it is claimed that it will be close to the intended. Our derivation make it possible to study accurately. Besides, we also prove that the confidence interval construction method in Hjort and Claeskens (2003) still works in linear regression with normal distribution error. Both the simulation and applied example support our theory conclusion.

KEY WORDS: Asymptotic distribution; General fixed parameter setup; Model averaging; Smoothed AIC; Smoothed BIC.

*Email: wangmm@amss.ac.cn

1 Introduction

Since Model Averaging was advocated, it has become one of the most important tools for estimation and inference available to statisticians. Unlike model selection, which picks a single model among the candidate models, model averaging incorporates all available information by averaging over all potential models. Model averaging is more robust than model selection because the averaging estimator considers the uncertainty across different models as well as the model bias from each candidate model. The central questions of concern are how to optimally assign the weights for candidate models and how to make inferences based on the averaging estimator.

Bayesian model averaging (BMA) and frequentist model averaging (FMA) are two branches of Model averaging, and here we restrict our attention to FMA. Some FMA strategies have been developed and studied, in which, weighting strategy based on the Akaike information criterion (AIC) or the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) scores proposed by Buckland et al. (1997) is probably the most widely used method because of convenience. See, for example, Burnham and Anderson (2004) and Layton and Lee (2006). However, in Buckland et al. (1997), there is a variance component due to model selection uncertainty that should be incorporated into estimates of precision. That is, one needs estimates that are unconditional on the selected model. They propose a simple estimator of the unconditional variance for the maximum likelihood estimator under the assumption that the parameters are perfect relevant. This inference can only be applied to parameters that are in common to all contending model.

However, a large number of authors have examined the inference of model averaging estimators. Hjort and Claeskens (2003) and Claeskens and Hjort (2008) studied the asymptotic properties of the FMA maximum likelihood estimator. Liu (2015) derived the limiting distributions of least squares averaging estimators for linear regression models. Other works on the asymptotic property of averaging estimators include Leung and Barron (2006), Pötscher (2006), Hansen (2009) and Hansen (2010). All of them used local misspecification assumption. Local misspecification assumption means that some parameters are of order $1/\sqrt{n}$, where n is sample size. Although this assumption

provides a suitable framework for studying the asymptotic theories of FMA estimators, it also draws comments from Raftery and Zheng (2003) because of its realism. Researchers aiming at estimating effects or parameters are more likely to use larger sample sizes. For example, the asymptotic properties in above papers are under large sample. However, as the sample size increases, the parameter space becomes smaller. So parameters under local misspecification assumption will be closer to the true value. In other words, all candidate models are closer to true model. This assumption is unreal under large sample. Furthermore, the local asymptotic framework induces the local parameters in the asymptotics, which generally cannot be estimated consistently. It is not just a technical regularity condition, but a key assumption about the way the world works. Recently, there have some studies about inference of model averaging estimators under general fixed parameter settings. For example, based on the Mallows criterion and the jackknife, Zhang and Liu (2018) derived the asymptotic distributions of the nested least squares averaging estimators. Without the local misspecification assumption, Mitra et al. (2019) established the limiting distributions of model averaging estimators but they must consider possible modeling biases.

In the current paper, under general fixed parameter setup, which do not rely on the assumption that all uncertain parameters are small, we investigate limiting distributions of model averaging estimators by weighting strategy based on the smoothed AIC (S-AIC) or smoothed BIC (S-BIC) scores. Our motivation is that S-AIC and S-BIC are very widely used model averaging and are very easily to implement. Especially, the optimal model averaging method Mallows model averaging (MMA) (Hansen (2007)) and jackknife model averaging (JMA) (Hansen and Racine (2012)) have only been well developed in linear models, but S-AIC and S-BIC can be used in all situations where AIC and BIC can be calculated. Besides, Buckland et al. (1997) didn't present a asymptotic distributions theory of model averaging estimators. They advocated a simple estimator of variance for the maximum likelihood estimator under the perfect correlation assumption. It will result in the overestimation and wider confidence interval.

Recently, Charkhi and Claeskens (2018) studied the asymptotic distribution of a special case of model averaging estimators, called Post-AIC-selection estimator, in which the weight for the model

with the smallest AIC value is equal to one and the remaining weights are equal to zero, with the weights summing to one and being random. Let $\{AIC_1, AIC_2, \dots, AIC_M\}$ be the AIC scores for all candidate models, more generally, Buckland et al. (1997) suggested estimators of the model average form using weights proportional to $\exp(-AIC_m/2)$, not just by means of indicator functions. These are two different weighting methods. S-AIC weights can approximate to the special form 1 for the selected model and 0 for all other models when the quantity $\exp(-AIC_m/2)$ of one model is large enough, that of other models are relatively small compared to it. The performance of their inference depends not only on the selected model, but also on candidate model set. They concerned two cases, including the classical setting in which a true model exists and is included in the candidate set of models and all candidate models are misspecified. But, we cannot construct confidence interval by the asymptotic distribution accurately if relaxing the assumption about the existence of a true model. More details refer to Charkhi and Claeskens (2018).

Therefore, under general fixed parameter setup, we study asymptotic distributions of model averaging estimators by weighting strategy based on the S-AIC or S-BIC scores and statistical inference, constructing the confidence intervals based on these asymptotic distributions. Buckland et al. (1997) and Burnham and Anderson (2002) provided an intuitive interval construction method. The resulting coverage probability of their confidence interval is not studied accurately, but it is claimed that it will be close to the intended value. We will confirm the validity of their method. Besides, we also prove that the confidence interval construction method for the linear function of the parameters in Hjort and Claeskens (2003) still works in linear regression with the normally distributed error. We will use the simulation study and real data analysis to support our methods.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. We present the candidate model set and the model averaging estimators in Section 2. In Section 3, the theoretical properties of the proposed model averaging method are exploited. Section 4 construct the confidence intervals based on our asymptotic distributions and briefly discuss each estimator and how to construct the confidence intervals for each estimator in the existing literature. The derivation for the methods in Buckland et al. (1997) and Hjort and Claeskens (2003) are provided in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2, respectively.

Simulations and real data analysis results are reported in Sections 5 and 6, to assess the performance of the proposed procedure compared to several existing model selection and model averaging methods. All proofs of technical details are provided in Appendix A.

2 Model Average Estimators

Suppose independent random variables y_1, \dots, y_n come from density f . Inference is sought for a certain parameter $\mu = \mu(f)$. In Hjort and Claeskens (2003), they concern with a model of the type

$$f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} \subset \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^q$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_q)^T = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T)^T$ with a $q_1 \times 1$ vector of parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and an additional $q_2 \times 1$ vector of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ parameters, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$ is fixed and known, which corresponds to the narrow model in the sense that $f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = f\left(y, (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0^T)^T\right)$. They investigate the asymptotic theory in a local misspecification framework

$$f_{true}(y) = f_n(y) = f\left(y, \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, (\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}/\sqrt{n})^T\right)^T\right).$$

The $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{q_2})^T$ parameters signify the degrees of the model departures in directions $1, \dots, q_2$, with due influence on the estimand $\mu_{true} = \mu\left(\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, (\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}/\sqrt{n})^T\right)^T\right)$.

In our paper, we study the asymptotic distribution of model averaging using AIC and BIC under general fixed parameter setup (1). Without loss of generality, we assume $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0 = \mathbf{0}$. Then we present the candidate models setting first. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ denote the true value of the parameters. Suppose that we combine M sub-models of (1) and the m^{th} sub-model has parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and some of the parameter γ_j , where γ_j is the j^{th} element of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. Denote k_m as the number of parameters including in the m^{th} sub-model. Typically, $M = 2^{q_2}$ if all possible models are considered and $M = q_2 + 1$ when combining nested models, one for each subset S of $\{1, \dots, q_2\}$. For the m^{th} sub-model, the subset $S_m = \{i_1, \dots, i_{k_m - q_1}\} \subset \{1, \dots, q_2\}$ and $S_m^c = \{i_{k_m - q_1 + 1}, \dots, i_{q_2}\}$ are the complement of S_m on set $\{1, \dots, q_2\}$. To facilitate the presentation, we write $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m} = \left(\gamma_{i_1}, \dots, \gamma_{i_{k_m - q_1}}\right)^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m^c} = \left(\gamma_{i_{k_m - q_1 + 1}}, \dots, \gamma_{i_{q_2}}\right)^T$, then the parameter in the m^{th} model is $\boldsymbol{\theta}_m = \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_m^T\right)^T$ where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_m =$

$(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{q_2})^T$ with $\gamma_{S_m^c} = \mathbf{0}$. In addition, through a series of permutations for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_m$, it can be written under the form $\boldsymbol{\theta}'_m = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}^T)^T$. We give a permutation matrix Π_m so that $\boldsymbol{\theta}'_m = \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\theta}_m$, where Π_m can be obtained by row permutation for unit matrix $\mathbf{I}_q = (\mathbf{e}_1^T, \mathbf{e}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{e}_q^T)^T$ and \mathbf{e}_j is a unit vector with the j^{th} element being 1, i.e.

$$\Pi_m = \left(\mathbf{e}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{q_1}^T, \mathbf{e}_{q_1+i_1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{q_1+i_{k_m-q_1}}^T, \mathbf{e}_{q_1+i_{k_m-q_1}+1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{q_1+i_{q_2}}^T \right)^T.$$

Denote $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}$ as the maximum-likelihood estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}$ under the m^{th} sub-model over parameter space $\Theta_m \subset \mathbb{R}^{k_m}$, which is the solution of the log likelihood equation $\sum_{t=1}^n \partial \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} = 0$. Define $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T$. Akaike (1973) has noted that since $l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m)$ is a natural alternative for $\text{E}\{\log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m)\}$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}$ is a natural estimator for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^*$, the parameter vector which minimizes the Kullback-Leibler Information Criterion (KLIC) defined in Kullback and Leibler (1951),

$$I \{f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) : f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m)\} = \text{E} \left[\log \left\{ \frac{f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m)} \right\} \right]. \quad (2)$$

Here, and in what follows, expectations are taken with respect to the true distribution. Hence,

$$I \{f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) : f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m)\} = \int f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \log f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) dy - \int f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \log f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) dy. \quad (3)$$

Adopting inverse permutations Π_m^T for $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^{*T}, \mathbf{0}^T)^T$, we can obtain $\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*$, which has the same order of parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. Define $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m$ as the estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_m$ under the m^{th} sub-model over $\Theta_m \subset \mathbb{R}^{k_m}$, so the model averaging estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{w}) = \sum_{m=1}^M w_m \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m$, where w_m is the weight corresponding to the m^{th} sub-model and $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_M)^T$, belonging to weight set $\mathcal{W} = \{\mathbf{w} \in [0, 1]^M : \sum_{m=1}^M w_m = 1\}$.

Next, we introduce some frequentist model averaging strategies. In the m^{th} candidate model, AIC and BIC scores are $\text{AIC}_m = -2 \sum_{t=1}^n \log f(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) + 2k_m$ and $\text{BIC}_m = -2 \sum_{t=1}^n \log f(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) + k_m \log n$, respectively. Define the following weights:

$$\widehat{w}_{\text{xIC}, m} = \exp(-\text{xIC}_m/2) / \sum_{m=1}^M \exp(-\text{xIC}_m/2), \quad m = 1, \dots, M, \quad (4)$$

where xIC_m is the AIC or BIC value from the m^{th} sub-model. The corresponding average estimators

are commonly called S-AIC or S-BIC estimators:

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m, \quad (5)$$

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m. \quad (6)$$

3 Inference after weighting strategy based on the AIC or BIC scores

Before presenting asymptotic results, we give some notations and list the regularity conditions, where all limiting processes here and throughout the text are with respect to $n \rightarrow \infty$ and notations \xrightarrow{d} , $\xrightarrow{a.s.}$ and \xrightarrow{p} denote convergence in distribution, almost surely and in probability, respectively.

The likelihood function is defined as

$$L_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{t=1}^n f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

and the log likelihood function is denoted by $l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log L_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. We assume that the first and second partial derivatives of $f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ exist. Let

$$\Psi(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \partial \log f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}, \quad \text{a } q \times 1 \text{ vector,}$$

$$\dot{\Psi}(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \partial^2 \log f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T, \quad \text{a } q \times q \text{ matrix}$$

and then

$$A_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi}(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (7)$$

Then the first and second partial derivatives of $l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are $\dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{t=1}^n \Psi(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\ddot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi}(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, respectively. Fisher Information is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = E \{ \Psi(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \Psi(y, \boldsymbol{\theta})^T \}, \quad \text{a } q \times q \text{ matrix.}$$

Correspondingly, for the m^{th} sub-model, define $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m} = \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m}^T, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m^c}^T)^T$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m}$ is the first k_m elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m^c}$ is the remaining $q - k_m$ elements. Denote

$$\mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) = E \{ \Psi(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) \Psi(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m})^T \} = \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T, \quad \text{a } q \times q \text{ matrix.}$$

When the partial derivatives exist, we define the vectors and matrices

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_m(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= \partial \log f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}, \text{ a } k_m \times 1 \text{ vector,} \\
\dot{\Psi}_m(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= \partial^2 \log f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T, \text{ a } k_m \times k_m \text{ matrix,} \\
A_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi}_m(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}), \\
B_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \Psi_m(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) \Psi_m(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m})^T, \\
\dot{l}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= \sum_{t=1}^n \Psi_m(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}), \\
\text{and } \ddot{l}_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi}_m(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}).
\end{aligned}$$

If expectations also exist, we define the matrices

$$\begin{aligned}
A_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= E \left\{ \dot{\Psi}_m(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) \right\}, \\
B_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= E \left\{ \Psi_m(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) \Psi_m(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m})^T \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= A_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m})^{-1} B_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) A_{m,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m})^{-1}, \\
C_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) &= A_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m})^{-1} B_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}) A_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m})^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the inverse matrixes are assumed to exist. The Fisher Information matrix of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m}$ is denoted by

$$\mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m}) = E \left\{ \Psi_m(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m}) \Psi_m(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m})^T \right\}, \text{ a } k_m \times k_m \text{ matrix.}$$

Assume that the m_o^{th} model is the true model, which means that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m_o} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{0,m}$ are the maximum-likelihood estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}$ under the true model over Θ , respectively. Any sub-model including all regressors of the true model is called overfitted model, contained by set \mathcal{O} . The remaining sub-models are underfitted models, contained by set \mathcal{U} . The notations $m \in \mathcal{O}$ and $m \in \mathcal{U}$ imply the m^{th} model is overfitted model and underfitted model, respectively.

We now give some regular conditions required for our theorems.

Condition (C.1). *The density $f(y, \theta)$ is measurable in y for every θ in Θ , a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^q , continuous in θ for every y in Ω , a measurable Euclidean space, and the true parameter point θ_0 is identifiable.*

Condition (C.2). (a) $E\{\log f(y_t, \theta_m)\}$ exists and $|\log f(y, \theta_m)| \leq K_m(y)$ for all θ_m in Θ , where $K_m(y)$ is integrable;

(b) $I\{f(y, \theta_{0,m}) : f(y, \theta_m)\}$ has a unique minimum at θ_m^* with $\theta_{S_m}^*$ being in Θ_m .

Condition (C.3). (a) $\partial \log f(y, \theta_m) / \partial \theta_i, i = 1, \dots, k_m$, are bounded in absolute value by a function integrable uniformly in some neighborhood of θ_0 .

(b) Second partial derivative of $f(y, \theta_m)$ with respect to θ_m exists and is continuous for all y , and may be passed under the integral sign in $\int f(y, \theta_m) dy$.

Condition (C.4). $|\partial^2 \log f(y, \theta_m) / \partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j|$ and $|\partial \log f(y, \theta_m) / \partial \theta_i \cdot \partial \log f(y, \theta_m) / \partial \theta_j|, i, j = 1, \dots, k_m$ are dominated by functions integrable for all y in Ω and θ_m in Θ .

Condition (C.5). (a) $\theta_{S_m}^*$ is interior to Θ_m ; (b) $B(\theta_{S_m}^*)$ is nonsingular; (c) $\theta_{S_m}^*$ is a regular point of $A_m(\theta_{S_m})$, which means θ_{S_m} is a value such that $A_m(\theta_{S_m})$ has constant rank in some open neighborhood of $\theta_{S_m}^*$.

Condition (C.6). Fisher Information $\mathcal{F}(\theta_0)$ is a positive definite matrix.

Condition (C.7). $|\partial \{ \partial f(y, \theta) / \theta_i \cdot f(y, \theta) \} / \partial \theta_j|, i, j = 1, \dots, q$, are dominated by functions integrable for all θ in Θ , and the minimal support of $f(y, \theta)$ does not depend on θ .

Remark 1. *Condition (C.2) ensures that the KLIC is well-defined. Condition (C.3)(a) allows us to apply a Uniform Law of Large Numbers. Condition (C.3)(b) ensures that the first two derivatives with respect to θ_{S_m} . Condition (C.4) ensures that the derivatives are appropriately dominated by functions integrable, which ensures that $A_m(\theta_{S_m})$ and $B_m(\theta_{S_m})$ are continuous in θ_{S_m} and that we can apply a Uniform Law of Large Numbers to $A_{m,n}(\theta_{S_m})$ and $B_{m,n}(\theta_{S_m})$. We can find the same assumptions in White (1982) and Ferguson (1996).*

Under the m^{th} model, the likelihood ratio test statistic is

$$\lambda_{m,n} = \frac{\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_m} \prod_{t=1}^n f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \prod_{t=1}^n f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \frac{\prod_{t=1}^n f(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)}{\prod_{t=1}^n f(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_o)}.$$

Let \mathbf{I}_q be an identity matrix. We can draw the following conclusion.

Lemma 1. *If Conditions (C.1), (C.3) and (C.6) are satisfied, then when model $m \in \mathcal{O}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} -2\log\lambda_{m,n} &= (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[\{\Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T\}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \boldsymbol{\kappa}^T P_m \boldsymbol{\kappa} \sim \chi^2(q - k_m), \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_q)$ and

$$P_m = \{\Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\{\Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T\}^{-1} - H_m \right] \{\Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. See Appendix A.1. □

Lemma 2. *For any underfitted model $m \in \mathcal{U}$, under Conditions (C.1),(C.2) and Conditions (C.3)(b)-(C.5), we have*

$$n^{-1} l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) = \mathbb{E} \{\log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*)\} + o_p(1). \quad (8)$$

Proof. See Appendix A.2. □

Let

$$G_m = \exp \left\{ (\Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta})^T \left\{ H_m - (\Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T)^{-1} \right\} \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} / 2 - k_m \right\}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \mathcal{N}\{0, \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\}$. Define $\mathbf{w}_{m_o}^o$ to be a vector with the m^{th} element taking on the value of unity and other elements zeros, and $\mathbf{w}_{\text{AIC},m}$ to be an $M \times 1$ vector with the m^{th} element

$$w_{\text{AIC},m} = \frac{\mathbf{1}\{m \in \mathcal{O}\} G_m}{G},$$

where $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ is an indicator function and $G = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} G_m$. Then we can derive the asymptotic distributions of the S-AIC and S-BIC weights as follows.

Lemma 3. Let $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}} = (\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},1}, \dots, \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},M})^T$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}} = (\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC},1}, \dots, \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC},M})^T$. If Conditions (C.1)-(C.6) are satisfied, then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{w}_{\text{AIC}} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}} \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{w}_{m_o}^o. \quad (10)$$

Proof. See Appendix A.3. □

Let Δ_m be a diagonal selection matrix so that

$$\Delta_m = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{q_1} & & & & \\ & \delta_1^m & & & \\ & & \delta_2^m & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \delta_{q_2}^m \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\delta_j^m = \begin{cases} 1, & j \in S_m, \\ 0, & j \notin S_m. \end{cases}$$

We denote $\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}})$, $\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}})$ and $\theta_{j,0}$ as the j^{th} components of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}})$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}})$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, respectively.

Then we can establish the asymptotic distributions for the S-AIC and S-BIC estimators.

Lemma 4. If Conditions (C.1)-(C.7) are satisfied, then

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right\} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} (G_m/G) \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} \quad (11)$$

and $\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) \xrightarrow{d} 0$ for $j \notin S_{m_o}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) \xrightarrow{d} Z_{j,m_o}$ for $j \in S_{m_o}$, where $Z_{j,m_o} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{j,m_o}^2)$ and σ_{j,m_o}^2 is the j^{th} element on the diagonal of matrix

$$\Sigma_{m_o} = \Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) (\Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o})^T.$$

Proof. See Appendix A.4. □

However, S-AIC and S-BIC estimators are not very appropriate to estimate θ_0 , because some elements of $\widehat{\theta}_m$ are directly set to 0 so that the sum of weight associated with estimators is not 1. Therefore, as in Buckland et al. (1997), we use the scaled S-AIC and scaled S-BIC estimators, seeking weights that can be associated with estimators drawn under each of the contending models including parameter θ_j and denoted by l_v^j , $v = 1, \dots, M_j$. Denote l_v^j

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}^j = \left(\frac{\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}, l_1^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}, l_v^j}}, \dots, \frac{\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}, l_{M_j}^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}, l_v^j}} \right)^T,$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}^j = \left(\frac{\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}, l_1^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}, l_v^j}}, \dots, \frac{\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}, l_{M_j}^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}, l_v^j}} \right)^T$$

and $\widehat{\theta}_m = (\widehat{\theta}_{1,m}, \dots, \widehat{\theta}_{q,m})^T$, where $\widehat{\theta}_{j,m}$ is the j th component of $\widehat{\theta}_m$. Therefore the scaled S-AIC and scaled S-BIC estimators for θ_j are

$$\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}^j) = \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}, l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}, l_v^j}} \widehat{\theta}_{j, l_v^j} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}^j) = \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}, l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}, l_v^j}} \widehat{\theta}_{j, l_v^j}, \quad (12)$$

respectively. Denote

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) = \left(\widehat{\theta}_1(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}^1), \dots, \widehat{\theta}_q(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}^q) \right)^T$$

and

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) = \left(\widehat{\theta}_1(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}^1), \dots, \widehat{\theta}_q(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}^q) \right)^T.$$

Next, we establish the asymptotic distributions of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s})$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s})$.

Theorem 1. *If Conditions (C.1)-(C.7) are satisfied, then*

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}^j) - \theta_{j,0} \right\} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} \frac{G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \widetilde{\eta}_{j, l_v^j}$$

and $\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}^j) \xrightarrow{d} 0$ for $j \notin S_{m_o}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}^j) \xrightarrow{d} Z_{j, m_o}$ for $j \in S_{m_o}$, where $\widetilde{\eta}_{j, l_v^j}$ is the j^{th} element of the vector $\Pi_{l_v^j}^T H_{S_{l_v^j}} \Pi_{l_v^j} \Delta_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}$ and other notations are the same as those in Lemma 4.

Proof. We can establish it easily from the proof of Lemma 4. □

Further, for the interested parameter $\mu = \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, which is a smooth real-valued function. Let $\hat{\mu}_m = \mu(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)$ denote the submodel estimators. Then the averaging estimators of μ based on S-AIC weight and S-BIC weight are

$$\hat{\mu}(\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \hat{\mu}_m \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mu}(\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \hat{\mu}_m, \quad (13)$$

respectively. Then by Lemma 4 and Delta Method, we can obtain the following conclusion.

Theorem 2. *Let $\dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \partial\mu/\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}$ be continuous in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. Then under the same assumptions of Lemma 4, we have*

$$\sqrt{n} \{\hat{\mu}(\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} (G_m/G) \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} \quad (14)$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} \{\hat{\mu}(\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \Sigma_{m_o} \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \quad (15)$$

where the notations are the same as that in Lemma 4.

Proof. See Appendix A.4. □

4 Construction of confidence intervals based on model averaging

Under general fixed parameter setup, in order to compare our method with the existing methods in the literature, in this section, we construct the confidence intervals based on our asymptotic distributions and briefly discuss each estimator and how to construct the confidence intervals for each estimator in the existing literature, including Buckland et al. (1997), Hjort and Claeskens (2003) and Charkhi and Claeskens (2018). We also present the confidence intervals based on the largest model.

4.1 Confirmation of the validity of the method in Buckland et al. (1997).

Buckland et al. (1997) presented a simple estimator of variance for the maximum likelihood estimator under the perfect correlation assumption and then advocated simulated inference by bootstrap. Based on the variance estimators of model averaging estimators in Buckland et al. (1997),

(Burnham and Anderson, 2002, p.164) proposed ad-hoc confidence intervals and found it is more stable than the bootstrap method. Further, Burnham and Anderson (2002) gave many examples to illustrate that such intervals have excellent achieved coverage probability. But there is no theoretical explanation. Therefore, we will study the resulting coverage probability of the confidence interval in Burnham and Anderson (2002).

Let $z_{1-\alpha/2}$ be the $1-\alpha/2$ normal quantile. As in Buckland et al. (1997) and Burnham and Anderson (2002), the $1-\alpha$ confidence interval of θ_j based on SAIC weight (labeled by SAIC₉₇) is constructed as

$$CI_{\theta_j, n}(\text{SAIC}_{97}) = \left[\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) \right\}}, \right. \\ \left. \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) + z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) \right\}} \right], \quad (16)$$

where $\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) \right\}$ is the unconditional variance estimator proposed by Buckland et al. (1997), which is given by

$$\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) \right\} = \left[\frac{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \hat{w}_{\text{AIC}_s, l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \hat{w}_{\text{AIC}_s, l_v^j}} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}}(\hat{\theta}_{j, l_v^j} | l_v^j) + \left\{ \hat{\theta}_{j, l_v^j} - \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) \right\}^2} \right]^2$$

with $\widehat{\text{var}}(\hat{\theta}_{j, l_v^j} | l_v^j)$ being found by the normal inference methods based on model l_v^j . Similarly, the $1-\alpha$ confidence interval of $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ based on SAIC₉₇ method is constructed as

$$CI_{\mu, n}(\text{SAIC}_{97}) = \left[\hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) \right\}}, \right. \\ \left. \hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) + z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) \right\}} \right], \quad (17)$$

where

$$\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) \right\} = \left[\frac{\sum_{m=1}^M \hat{w}_{\text{AIC}, m}}{\sum_{m=1}^M \hat{w}_{\text{AIC}, m}} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}}(\hat{\mu}_m | m) + \left\{ \hat{\mu}_m - \hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) \right\}^2} \right]^2,$$

with $\widehat{\text{var}}(\hat{\mu}_m | m)$ being found by normal inference methods under model m . For the method in Buckland et al. (1997) based on SBIC weight (SBIC₉₇), we only need to replace $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}$ by $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}$ by $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}}$ in the above confidence interval formula.

In the following, we confirm the validity of these intervals. Let $\sigma_{j,l_v^j}^2$ denote the j^{th} diagonal element of the matrix

$$\Sigma_{l_v^j} = \Pi_{l_v^j}^T H_{S_{l_v^j}} \Pi_{l_v^j} \Delta_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \left(\Pi_{l_v^j}^T H_{S_{l_v^j}} \Pi_{l_v^j} \Delta_{l_v^j} \right)^T.$$

From Lemma 3, we see that when $l_v^j \in \mathcal{U}$, $\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},l_v^j} \xrightarrow{p} 0$. From the proof of Lemma 4, we can conclude that when $l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}$, $\widehat{\theta}_{j,l_v^j} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta_{j,0}$ and $\sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\theta}_{j,l_v^j} - \theta_{j,0} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j}$, where $\widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \sigma_{j,l_v^j}^2 \right)$. Because $\widehat{\text{var}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_{j,l_v^j} | l_v^j \right)$ is found by normal inference methods under model l_v^j , Then $n \widehat{\text{var}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_{j,l_v^j} | l_v^j \right) \xrightarrow{p} \sigma_{j,l_v^j}^2$. Since $\sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) - \theta_{j,0} \right\}$ and $\sqrt{n \widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) \right\}}$ can be expressed the function of the same random vector in probability, by

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) - \theta_{j,0} \right\} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} \frac{G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n \widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) \right\}} \\ &= \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}_s, l_v^j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{M_j} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}_s, l_v^j}} \sqrt{n \widehat{\text{var}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_{j,l_v^j} | l_v^j \right) + \left[\sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_{j,l_v^j} - \widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) \right\} \right]^2} \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \sqrt{\sigma_{j,l_v^j}^2 + \left[\widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j} - \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j} \right]^2}, \end{aligned}$$

we have the following conclusion

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) - \theta_{j,0}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) \right\}}} = \frac{\sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) - \theta_{j,0} \right)}{\sqrt{n \widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \widehat{\theta}_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s} \right) \right\}}} \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \Lambda_j = \frac{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \sqrt{\sigma_{j,l_v^j}^2 + \left[\widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j} - \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j} \right]^2}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j} \widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j} \sqrt{\sigma_{j,l_v^j}^2 + \left[\widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j} - \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \widetilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j} \right]^2}}, \end{aligned}$$

(18)

where

$$G_{l_v^j} = \exp \left(\left\{ \Pi_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} \right\}^T \left[H_{l_v^j} - \left\{ \Pi_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_{l_v^j}^T \right\}^{-1} \right] \Pi_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} / 2 - k_{l_v^j} \right)$$

and $\tilde{\eta}_{j,l_v^j} = \mathbf{e}_j^T \Pi_{l_v^j}^T H_{S_{l_v^j}} \Pi_{l_v^j} \Delta_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}$ with $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) \right\}} \leq \theta_{j,0} \leq \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) + z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) \right\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left[-z_{1-\alpha/2} \leq \frac{\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) - \theta_{j,0}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) \right\}}} \leq z_{1-\alpha/2} \right] \\ &\rightarrow \mathbb{P} \left(-z_{1-\alpha/2} \leq \Lambda_j \leq z_{1-\alpha/2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The limiting coverage probability cannot be directly calculated. We first consider some special cases. For example, when the number of the overfit model is 1, $\Lambda_j = \frac{\tilde{\eta}_{j,m_o}}{\sigma_{j,m_o}}$, so the limiting coverage probability is $1 - \alpha$. However, when the the number of the overfit model is more than 1, Λ is clearly not standard normal. But it is approximately standard normal. To illustrate this, consider a simulation-based method. If a set of observations is approximately normally distributed, a normal quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plot of the observations will result in an approximately straight line. The true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ in Λ_j is estimated by scaled S-BIC estimator. Generate $q \times 1$ normal random vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(r)} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{w}_{\text{BIC}_s}) \right) \right)$ for $r = 1, \dots, R_0$, where R_0 is sufficiently large. For each r , we compute

$$\hat{\Lambda}^{(r)} = \frac{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j} \tilde{\eta}_j^{(r)}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j} \sqrt{\sigma_{j,l_v^j}^2 + \left(\tilde{\eta}_j^{(r)} - \sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \frac{\mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{v=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} G_{l_v^j}} \tilde{\eta}_j^{(r)} \right)^2}},$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_j^{(r)} = \mathbf{e}_j^T \Pi_{l_v^j}^T H_{S_{l_v^j}} \Pi_{l_v^j} \Delta_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(r)}$. We obtain R_0 samples from the asymptotic distributions Λ , then we can do a Q-Q plot to compared with standard normal distribution. In the next section, We use simulated method to verify that Λ_j is approximately standard normal distribution.

Similarly, from the proof of Lemma 4, we know $\sqrt{n} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) - \theta_{j,0} \right\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{j,m_o}^2)$ and when $l_v^j = m_o$, $\hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m_o} \xrightarrow{p} 1$, otherwise $\hat{w}_{\text{BIC},l_v^j} \xrightarrow{p} 0$. Then

$$\frac{\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) - \theta_{j,0}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) \right\}}} = \frac{\sqrt{n} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) - \theta_{j,0} \right\}}{\sqrt{n \widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) \right\}}} \xrightarrow{d} \frac{\tilde{\eta}_{j,m_o}}{\sigma_{j,m_o}}. \quad (20)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{P} \left[\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) \right\}} \leq \theta_{j,0} \leq \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) + z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) \right\}} \right] \\ &= \text{P} \left[-z_{1-\alpha/2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{n} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) - \theta_{j,0} \right\}}{\sqrt{n \widehat{\text{var}} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) \right\}}} \leq z_{1-\alpha/2} \right] \\ &\rightarrow \text{P} \left(-z_{1-\alpha/2} \leq \frac{\tilde{\eta}_{j,m_o}}{\sigma_{j,m_o}} \leq z_{1-\alpha/2} \right) = 1 - \alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The similar results can be concluded for the confidence interval (17) by the same proof technique and thus omitted.

4.2 Confidence intervals of Hjort and Claeskens (2003)

In this subsection, we delve into the coverage probability of the confidence intervals derived by Hjort and Claeskens (2003). The method in Hjort and Claeskens (2003) is to derive the asymptotic distribution of the model averaging estimators under local misspecification assumption and then put forward the confidence intervals of the parameters. The methods of constructing intervals are labeled by SAIC_L and SBIC_L , whose estimators are based on S-AIC and S-BIC weights respectively. We will further analyze the performance of these confidence intervals under the general fixed parameter settings.

In order to describe the inference in Hjort and Claeskens (2003), we first present some notations. The Fisher Information matrix is

$$J_{full} = \mathcal{F} \left((\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T \right) = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \times q_1 & q_1 \times q_2 \\ J_{00} & J_{01} \\ J_{10} & J_{11} \\ q_2 \times q_1 & q_2 \times q_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with inverse matrix

$$J_{full}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \times q_1 & q_1 \times q_2 \\ J^{00} & J^{01} \\ J^{10} & J^{11} \\ q_2 \times q_1 & q_2 \times q_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In Hjort and Claeskens (2003), if we focus on the parameter $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is constructed as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{w}(D_n)) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \widehat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \widehat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n}, \right. \\ & \left. \widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{w}(D_n)) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \widehat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \widehat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\widehat{\mu}$ is the corresponding model averaging estimator of μ ; $z_{1-\alpha/2}$ is the $1 - \alpha/2$ normal quantile; \widehat{J}_{00}^{-1} , \widehat{J}_{10} , \widehat{J}_{01} and \widehat{J}_{11} are the sample estimators of J_{00}^{-1} , J_{10} , J_{01} and J_{11} , respectively; $\widehat{K} = \left(\widehat{J}_{11} - \widehat{J}_{10} \widehat{J}_{00}^{-1} \widehat{J}_{01} \right)^{-1}$ is the estimator for $K = (J_{11} - J_{10} J_{00}^{-1} J_{01})^{-1}$; $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = \widehat{J}_{10} \widehat{J}_{00}^{-1} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} - \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ and $\widehat{\varphi} = \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)^T \widehat{J}_{00}^{-1} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \widehat{K} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \right\}^{1/2}$ are consistent estimators of $\boldsymbol{\omega} = J_{10} J_{00}^{-1} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} - \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ and $\varphi = \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)^T J_{00}^{-1} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + \boldsymbol{\omega}^T K \boldsymbol{\omega} \right\}^{1/2}$, where the partial derivatives are evaluated under the narrow model $(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T$; Let Γ_m be $(k_m - q_1) \times q_2$ projection matrix mapping $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_m$ to the subvector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m} = \Gamma_m \boldsymbol{\gamma}_m$ and denote $K_m = (\Gamma_m K^{-1} \Gamma_m^T)^{-1}$; $\widehat{\delta}(D_n) = K^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M w_m(D_n) V_m \right\} K^{-1/2} D_n$ with $D_n = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{full} = \sqrt{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{full}$ and $V_m = K^{-1/2} \Gamma_m^T K_m \Gamma_m K^{-1/2}$.

It is clear that

$$J_{S_m} = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \times q_1 & q_1 \times (k_m - q_1) \\ J_{00} & J_{01}\Gamma_m^T \\ \Gamma_m J_{10} & \Gamma_m J_{11}\Gamma_m^T \\ (k_m - q_1) \times q_1 & (k_m - q_1) \times (k_m - q_1) \end{pmatrix}$$

with inverse matrix

$$J_{S_m}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \times q_1 & q_1 \times (k_m - q_1) \\ J^{00,m} & J^{01,m} \\ J^{10,m} & J^{11,m} \\ (k_m - q_1) \times q_1 & (k_m - q_1) \times (k_m - q_1) \end{pmatrix}.$$

For SAIC_L and SBIC_L , let $\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}})$ and $\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}})$ denote the j^{th} component of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}})$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}})$, respectively. Then the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of θ_j based on SAIC_L and SBIC_L methods are constructed as:

$$\begin{aligned} CI_{\theta_j,n}(\text{SAIC}_L) &= \left[\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \hat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \hat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} CI_{\theta_j,n}(\text{SBIC}_L) &= \left[\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \hat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \hat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Similarly, the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ based on SAIC_L and SBIC_L methods are constructed as:

$$\begin{aligned} CI_{\mu,n}(\text{SAIC}_L) &= \left[\hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \hat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \hat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

and

$$CI_{\mu,n}(\text{SBIC}_L) = \left[\hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \hat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n}, \right.$$

$$\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \widehat{\delta}(D_n) \right\} / \sqrt{n} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \widehat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n}. \quad (26)$$

Next, we explain why the results of Hjort and Claeskens (2003) are not necessarily true under the general fixed parameter setup. Let the fixed parameter setup be $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \mu\left(y, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T)^T\right) = \mu\left(y, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \boldsymbol{\delta}^T)^T\right) = \mu\left(y, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \boldsymbol{\delta}/\sqrt{n}^T)^T\right)$, then $\boldsymbol{\delta}' = \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is fixed and $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\delta}'$. Therefore, the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of μ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D'_n - \widehat{\delta}(D'_n) \right\} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \widehat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n}, \right. \\ & \left. \widehat{\mu}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D'_n - \widehat{\delta}(D'_n) \right\} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \widehat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $D'_n = \widehat{\delta}'_{full} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{full}$.

In the following, we explain why the results of Hjort and Claeskens (2003) are not necessarily true under the general fixed parameter setup.

Denoting $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} = \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{S_m}^T, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{S_m}^T \right)^T$, using Taylor expansion for

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f \left(y_t, \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, S_m}^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}}$$

in $(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T$ and by $\sum_{t=1}^n \partial \log f \left(y_t, \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, S_m}^T \right)^T \right) / \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f \left(y_t, \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, S_m}^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[\frac{\partial \log f \left(y_t, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_0^T)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T}, \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_0^T)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}^T} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left(\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right)^T, (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, S_m})^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[\frac{\partial \log f \left(y_t, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} + \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0^T, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_0^T)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\left(\left(\widehat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0 \right)^T, \left(\widehat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0,S_m} \right)^T \right)^T,$$

where $\left(\widetilde{\beta}_0^T, \widetilde{\gamma}_0^T \right)^T = \left(\widetilde{\beta}_0^T, \widetilde{\gamma}_{0,S_m}^T, \gamma_{0,S_m^c}^T \right)^T$ is between $\left(\beta_0^T, \gamma_0^T \right)^T$ and $\left(\widehat{\theta}_{S_m}^T, \gamma_{0,S_m^c}^T \right)^T$. Therefore,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0 \right) \\ \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0,S_m} \right) \end{pmatrix} = \left(-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, \left(\widetilde{\beta}_0^T, \widetilde{\gamma}_0^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T} \right)^{-1} \cdot \sqrt{n} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f \left(y_t, \theta_0 \right)}{\partial \theta_{S_m}} \right] \quad (28)$$

Following the proof of Theorem 18 in Ferguson (1996), first note that $E \{ \Psi_m(y, \theta_{S_m}) \}$ is continuous in θ_{S_m} . For any $\varepsilon > 0$, then there is a $\rho > 0$ such that $|\theta_{S_m} - \theta_{0,S_m}| < \rho$ implies

$$\left| E \dot{\Psi}_m(y, \theta_{S_m}) + J_{S_m} \right| < \varepsilon. \quad (29)$$

Next note from the Uniform Strong Law of Large Numbers that with probability 1 there is an integer N such that $n > N$ implies

$$\sup_{\theta_{S_m} \in \{ \theta_{S_m} : |\theta_{S_m} - \theta_{0,S_m}| < \rho \}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi}_m(y_t, \theta_{S_m}) - E \dot{\Psi}_m(y, \theta_{S_m}) \right| < \varepsilon. \quad (30)$$

By (29) and (30), when $n > N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, \left(\beta_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T} + J_{S_m} \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\theta_{S_m} \in \{ \theta_{S_m} : |\theta_{S_m} - \theta_{0,S_m}| < \rho \}} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi}_m(y, \theta_{S_m}) - E \dot{\Psi}_m(y, \theta_{S_m}) \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left| E \dot{\Psi}_m(y, \theta_{S_m}) + J_{S_m} \right| \right\} \leq 2\varepsilon \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

But it is no guarantee that $\left(\widehat{\theta}_{S_m}^T, \gamma_{0,S_m^c}^T \right)^T \xrightarrow{a.s.} \left(\beta_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T$ under general fixed parameter setup. It means that there is no guarantee that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, \left(\widetilde{\beta}_0^T, \widetilde{\gamma}_0^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, \left(\beta_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T}. \quad (32)$$

Note that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, \left(\widetilde{\beta}_0^T, \widetilde{\gamma}_0^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T} + J_{S_m} \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, \left(\tilde{\beta}_0^T, \tilde{\gamma}_0^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, \left(\beta_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f \left(y_t, \left(\beta_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T} + J_{S_m} \right|. \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we cannot guarantee

$$-\sum_{t=1}^n \partial^2 \log f \left\{ y_t, \left(\tilde{\beta}_0^T, \tilde{\gamma}_0^T \right)^T \right\} / (n \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T) \xrightarrow{a.s.} J_{S_m}.$$

Applying Taylor expansion for $f \left(y, \left\{ \beta_0^T, \boldsymbol{\delta}^T \right\}^T \right)$ in $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, we have

$$f \left(y, \left(\beta_0^T, \boldsymbol{\delta}^T \right)^T \right) = f \left(y, \left(\beta_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T \right) \left\{ 1 + \frac{\partial \log f \left(y, \left(\beta_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T \right)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{\delta}' + R_1(y, \boldsymbol{\delta}') \right\},$$

where $R_1(y, \boldsymbol{\delta}')$ is a remainder term. Under general fixed parameter setup, the remainder of $f(y, (\beta_0^T, \boldsymbol{\delta}^T)^T)$ does not necessarily tend to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, in Hjort and Claeskens (2003), the asymptotic distributions of the model averaging estimators are not derived so that the confidence interval of $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ based on the method does not achieve the nominal level.

Under the fixed parameter setup, the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
CI_{\mu, n} &= \left[\hat{\mu}(\mathbf{w}(D_n)) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D'_n - \hat{\delta}(D'_n) \right\} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n}, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \hat{\mu}(\mathbf{w}(D_n)) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D'_n - \hat{\delta}(D'_n) \right\} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\varphi} / \sqrt{n} \right] \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

with $D'_n = \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}'_{full} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{full}$.

However, when μ is a linear function of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, the result is different in linear regression model with normally distributed error. Consider a linear regression model with a finite number of regressors

$$y_t = \mathbf{x}_t^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{z}_t^T \boldsymbol{\gamma} + e_t \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{35}$$

where y_t is a scalar dependent variable, $\mathbf{x}_t = (x_{t,1}, \dots, x_{t,q_1})^T$ and $\mathbf{z}_t = (z_{t,1}, \dots, z_{t,q_2})^T$ are vectors of regressors and independent and identically distributed, and $e_t, t = 1, \dots, n$ are taken to be independent and normally distributed $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \beta}}{\frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \gamma}} \right) &= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (-\mathbf{x}_t y_t + \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T \beta_0 + \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T \delta') \\ -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (-\mathbf{z}_t y_t + \mathbf{z}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T \delta' + \mathbf{z}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T \beta_0) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (-\mathbf{x}_t y_t + \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T \beta_0) \\ -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (-\mathbf{z}_t y_t + \mathbf{z}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T \beta_0) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T \delta' \\ -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{z}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T \delta' \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, \beta_0, \gamma_0)}{\partial \beta} \\ \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, \beta_0, \gamma_0)}{\partial \gamma} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T \\ -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{z}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T \end{pmatrix} \delta' \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T} &= -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T & \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T \\ \mathbf{z}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T & \mathbf{z}_t \mathbf{z}_t^T \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \mathbf{0}^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^T}. \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Taylor expansion for

$$\sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}^T, \gamma_{0, S_m}^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}}$$

in $(\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T$ and by $\sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}^T, \gamma_{0, S_m}^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[\frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} \right. \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T}, \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \gamma_{S_m}^T} \right) \\
&\quad \left. \left((\hat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0)^T, (\hat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0, S_m})^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T + \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T} \delta' \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[\frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} + \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^T} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left((\hat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0)^T, (\hat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0, S_m})^T \right)^T + \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m} \partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T} \delta' \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $(\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T$ is between $(\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T$ and $(\hat{\theta}_{S_m}^T, \gamma_{0, S_m}^T)^T$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n} (\hat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0) \\ \sqrt{n} (\hat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0, S_m}) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\
& \quad \sqrt{n} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \theta_{S_m}} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \gamma^T} \delta' \right] \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\
& \quad \sqrt{n} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \Gamma_m \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \theta} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \gamma^T} \delta' \right]. \quad (38)
\end{aligned}$$

Then following traditional arguments given for proving asymptotic normality of maximum likelihood estimators in fixed parametric models, see, for example, Theorem 18 in Ferguson (1996), and by (37), we can conclude that random vector

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \theta} \right\} &= \sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \beta} \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \gamma} \end{pmatrix} \\
&\doteq \begin{pmatrix} M_n \\ N_n \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} M \\ N \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, J_{full}), \quad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

$$-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_i, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_i, \beta_0, \gamma_0)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \theta_{S_m}^T} \xrightarrow{a.s.} J_{S_m}, \quad (40)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \log f(y_t, (\check{\beta}_0^T, \check{\gamma}_0^T)^T)}{\partial \theta_{S_m} \partial \gamma^T} \delta' \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{z}_i^T \\ -\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \Gamma_m \mathbf{z}_i \mathbf{z}_i^T \end{pmatrix} \delta' \right\} = \begin{pmatrix} J_{01} \\ \Gamma_m J_{11} \end{pmatrix} \delta' \quad (41)$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, (\beta_0^T, \delta'^T)^T)}{\partial \theta_{S_m}} \right\}$$

$$\doteq \begin{pmatrix} M_n \\ N_n^m \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} M \\ N^m \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, J_{S_m}). \quad (42)$$

Therefore, substituting (40)-(42) into (43), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0) \\ \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0,S_m}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \{J_{S_m} + o_{a.s.}(1)\}^{-1} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} J_{01} \\ \Gamma_m J_{11} \end{pmatrix} \sqrt{n} \delta' + \begin{pmatrix} M_n \\ N_n^m \end{pmatrix} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

and then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0) \\ \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0,S_m}) \end{pmatrix} - J_{S_m}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} J_{01} \\ \Gamma_m J_{11} \end{pmatrix} \sqrt{n} \delta' \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, J_{S_m}^{-1}). \quad (44)$$

Let I_{q_2} be an identity matrix. Using the same proof skills, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_n &= \sqrt{n} \widehat{\gamma}_{full} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{q_2 \times q_1} & I_{q_2} \end{pmatrix} \{J_{full} + o_{a.s.}(1)\}^{-1} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} J_{01} \\ J_{11} \end{pmatrix} \delta' + \begin{pmatrix} M_n \\ N_n \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

and then

$$D_n - \sqrt{n} \delta' = J^{10} M_n + J^{11} N_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \doteq W_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \xrightarrow{d} W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, K). \quad (46)$$

Using Taylor expansion for $\widehat{\mu}_m - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mu}_m - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) &= \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T (\widehat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0) + \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \right\}^T (\widehat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0,S_m}) - \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right\}^T \delta' \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0 \\ \widehat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0,S_m} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 \mu(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} & \frac{\partial^2 \mu(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta} \partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \mu(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} & \frac{\partial^2 \mu(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma} \partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\beta}_{S_m} - \beta_0 \\ \widehat{\gamma}_{S_m} - \gamma_{0,S_m} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} - \delta', \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ is between $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}^T, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{S_m}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,S_m}^T)^T$.

When μ is a linear function of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, then by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 \mu(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} & \frac{\partial^2 \mu(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta} \partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T} \\ \frac{\partial^2 \mu(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^T} & \frac{\partial^2 \mu(\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma} \partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$$

and the asymptotic normality of maximum likelihood estimation, substituting (40)-(42) into (43), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n} \left[\{\widehat{\mu}_m - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\} + \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right\}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}' - \left(\frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)^T J_{S_m}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} J_{01} \\ \Gamma_m J_{11} \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\delta}' \right] \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \end{pmatrix}^T \left[\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\ \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,S_m}) \end{pmatrix} - J_{S_m}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} J_{01} \\ \Gamma_m J_{11} \end{pmatrix} \sqrt{n} \boldsymbol{\delta}' \right] \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \end{pmatrix}^T J_{S_m}^{-1} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} M_n \\ N_n^m \end{pmatrix} + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \end{pmatrix}^T J_{S_m}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} M \\ N^m \end{pmatrix} \doteq \Lambda_m, \tag{47}
\end{aligned}$$

From the proof of Lemma 3.3 in Hjort and Claeskens (2003), note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \end{pmatrix}^T J_{S_m}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} J_{01} \\ \Gamma_m J_{11} \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\delta}' - \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right\}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}' \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} J^{00,m} & J^{01,m} \\ J^{10,m} & J^{11,m} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J_{01} \\ \Gamma_m J_{11} \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\delta}' - \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right\}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}' \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T (J^{00,m} J_{01} + J^{01,m} \Gamma_m J_{11}) \boldsymbol{\delta}' \\
&\quad + \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \right\}^T (J^{10,m} J_{01} + J^{11,m} \Gamma_m J_{11}) \boldsymbol{\delta}' - \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right\}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}' \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T J_{00}^{-1} J_{01} (\mathbf{I}_{q_2} - K^{1/2} H_m K^{-1/2}) \boldsymbol{\delta}' \\
&\quad + \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right\}^T (\Gamma_m^T K_m \Gamma_m K^{-1}) \boldsymbol{\delta}' - \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}} \right\}^T \boldsymbol{\delta}' \\
&= \boldsymbol{\omega}^T (\mathbf{I}_{q_2} - K^{1/2} H_m K^{-1/2}) \boldsymbol{\delta}' \tag{48}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_m &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \end{pmatrix}^T J_{S_m}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} M \\ N^m \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} J^{00,m} & J^{01,m} \\ J^{10,m} & J^{11,m} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} M \\ N^m \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T (J^{00,m} M + J^{01,m} N^m) + \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{S_m}} \right\}^T (J^{10,m} M + J^{11,m} N^m)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T (J_{00}^{-1}M - J_{00}^{-1}J_{01}K^{1/2}H_mK^{-1/2}W) + \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \gamma_{S_m}} \right\}^T K_m \Gamma_m K^{-1}W \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T J_{00}^{-1}M - \boldsymbol{\omega}^T K^{1/2}H_mK^{-1/2}W.
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Therefore, we can get a conclusion similar to Lemma 3.3 in Hjort and Claeskens (2003),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{n} [\{\widehat{\mu}_m - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\} - \boldsymbol{\omega}^T (\mathbf{I}_{q_2} - K^{1/2}H_mK^{-1/2}) \boldsymbol{\delta}'] \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T J_{00}^{-1}M - \boldsymbol{\omega}^T K^{1/2}H_mK^{-1/2}W.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Note that W and M are independent. Since for all model m , $w_m(D_n)$ and $\widehat{\mu}_m$ can be expressed the function of the same random vector $(M_n^T, N_n^T)^T$ almost surely and $w_m(D_n)$ is continuous for D_n , by Continuous Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{n} \left(\left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M w_m(D_n) \widehat{\mu}_m - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} - \boldsymbol{\omega}^T \left[\mathbf{I}_{q_2} - K^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M w_m(D_n) H_m \right\} K^{-1/2} \right] \boldsymbol{\delta}' \right) \\
&= \sqrt{n} \left[\left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M w_m(D_n) \widehat{\mu}_m - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} - \boldsymbol{\omega}^T \left\{ \boldsymbol{\delta}' - \widehat{\delta}(\boldsymbol{\delta}') \right\} \right] \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T J_{00}^{-1}M - \boldsymbol{\omega}^T \widehat{\delta}(W) \doteq \Lambda,
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where $\widehat{\delta}(W) = K^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^M w_m(W) H_m \right\} K^{-1/2}W$, Λ is normally distributed with mean 0 and covariance matrix Σ no matter the parameters are fixed or local misspecification with

$$\Sigma = \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)^T J_{00}^{-1} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + \boldsymbol{\omega}^T \text{Var} \widehat{\delta}(W) \boldsymbol{\omega}. \tag{52}$$

Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_n &= \frac{\sqrt{n} \left[\widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{w}(D_n)) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D'_n - \widehat{\delta}(D'_n) \right\} \right]}{\widehat{\varphi}} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{n} \left[\widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{w}(D_n)) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right] - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ D_n - \widehat{\delta}(D_n) \right\}}{\widehat{\varphi}} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{n} \left[\widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{w}(D_n)) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \boldsymbol{\omega}^T \left\{ \boldsymbol{\delta}' - \widehat{\delta}(\boldsymbol{\delta}') \right\} \right] - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T (D_n - \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\delta}') + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^T \left\{ \widehat{\delta}(D_n) - \sqrt{n}\widehat{\delta}(\boldsymbol{\delta}') \right\}}{\widehat{\varphi}} \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \frac{\left\{ \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\}^T J_{00}^{-1}M - \boldsymbol{\omega}^T W}{\varphi} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

We establish that the limiting coverage probability is still $1 - \alpha$ when we replace δ with $\sqrt{n}\delta'$ in the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval in Hjort and Claeskens (2003). In other words, though the result in Hjort and Claeskens (2003) does not hold under general fixed parameter setup, the procedure is still valid for the linear function of the parameter θ in linear regression model with normally distributed error. The confidence interval in Hjort and Claeskens (2003) may also have asymptotically correct coverage for a linear model with random errors from other distributions, which remains for future research.

In the next section, we will further verify these theoretical results through Monte Carlo simulation.

4.3 Confidence intervals based on the asymptotic theory

In this subsection, we provide the simulation-based confidence intervals of scaled S-AIC estimators and scaled S-BIC estimators based on the asymptotic theory, where the scaled S-AIC and scaled S-BIC estimators for θ_0 and $\mu(\theta_0)$ are defined by (12) and (13), respectively. We call these two methods SAIC_F and SBIC_F . Next, we will describe them in detail.

For SAIC_F , as shown in Theorem 1, the asymptotic distribution of scaled S-AIC estimator is a nonstandard distribution. It cannot be directly used for inference. To address this issue, we follow Claeskens and Hjort (2008), Lu (2015), and DiTraglia (2016), and consider a simulation-based method to construct the confidence intervals. From Theorem 1, we see that the asymptotic distribution of the scaled S-AIC estimator is a nonlinear function of unknown parameter vector θ_0 , overfit model set \mathcal{O} and normal random vector η . Suppose that θ_0 and \mathcal{O} are known, then, by drawing the replicates from η , we could approximate the limiting distributions defined in Theorem 1 to arbitrary precision. This is the main idea of the simulation-based confidence intervals. In practice, we replace the unknown parameters with corresponding estimators. We then simulate the limiting distribution of the S-AIC estimator and use this simulated distribution to conduct inference. We now describe the simulation-based confidence intervals in details. The true parameter θ_0 in the asymptotic distribution of scaled S-AIC is estimated by scaled S-BIC estimator. Generate a sufficiently large number

of $q \times 1$ normal random vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{(r)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}_s})\right)\right)$ for $r = 1, \dots, R_0$. For each r , we compute the quantities of the asymptotic distributions derived in Theorem 1. That is, we first calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{G}_{l_v^j} &= \exp \left\{ \left[\Pi_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}_s})\right) \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(r)} \right]^T \left(H_{l_v^j} - \left[\Pi_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}\left\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}_s})\right\} \Pi_{l_v^j}^T \right]^{-1} \right) \Pi_{l_v^j} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathcal{F}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}_s})\right) \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(r)} / 2 - k_{l_v^j} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Then we compute

$$D_{\theta_j}^{(r)} = \sum_{k=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} \frac{\widehat{G}_{l_v^j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{M_j} \mathbf{1}\{l_v^j \in \mathcal{O}\} \widehat{G}_{l_v^j}} \widetilde{\eta}_{j, l_v^j}^{(r)},$$

where $\widetilde{\eta}_{j, l_v^j}^{(r)}$ is the j^{th} component of $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{l_v^j}^{(r)} = \Pi_{l_v^j}^T H_{S_{l_v^j}} \Pi_{l_v^j} \Delta_{l_v^j} \mathcal{F}\left\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}_s})\right\} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(r)}$. Let $\widehat{q}_{\text{AIC}_s, j}(\alpha/2)$ and $\widehat{q}_{\text{AIC}_s, j}(1 - \alpha/2)$ be the $\alpha/2$ and $1 - \alpha/2$ quantiles of $D_{\theta_j}^{(r)}$ for $r = 1, \dots, R_0$, respectively. The $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of θ_j with SAIC_F method is constructed as

$$CI_{\theta_j, n}(\text{SAIC}_F) = \left[\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) - n^{-1/2} \widehat{q}_{\text{AIC}_s, j}(1 - \alpha/2), \widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}_s}) - n^{-1/2} \widehat{q}_{\text{AIC}_s, j}(\alpha/2) \right]. \quad (55)$$

Similarly, based on the conclusion in Theorem 2, the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ with SAIC_F method is constructed as

$$CI_{\mu, n}(\text{SAIC}_F) = \left[\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - n^{-1/2} \widehat{q}_{\text{AIC}}(1 - \alpha/2), \widehat{\mu}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - n^{-1/2} \widehat{q}_{\text{AIC}}(\alpha/2) \right], \quad (56)$$

where $\widehat{q}_{\text{AIC}}(\alpha/2)$ and $\widehat{q}_{\text{AIC}}(1 - \alpha/2)$ be the $\alpha/2$ and $1 - \alpha/2$ quantiles of

$$D_{\mu}^{(r)} = \sum_{m \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \frac{\widehat{G}_m}{\sum_{m \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}} \widehat{G}_m} \dot{\mu}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}_s})\right)^T \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}^{(r)}$$

for $r = 1, \dots, R_0$.

For the parameter θ_j with $j \notin S_{m_o}$, the method SBIC_F cannot be used to calculate confidence intervals because the asymptotic distribution of the scaled S-BIC estimator is a degenerate distribution. The true parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ in the asymptotic distribution of scaled S-BIC estimator is also estimated by the scaled S-BIC estimator. We first compute the $\alpha/2$ quantile of every component of random variable from the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}\left(0, \widehat{\Sigma}\right)$, where

$$\widehat{\Sigma} = \Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o} \mathcal{F}\left\{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC}_s})\right\} \left(\Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o}\right)^T.$$

$\widehat{\sigma}_j$ is the j^{th} element on the diagonal of matrix $\widehat{\Sigma}$ and the $\alpha/2$ quantile of $\mathcal{N}(0, \widehat{\sigma}_j)$ is denoted by $z_{bic_s, j}(\alpha/2)$. Then the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of θ_j with SBIC_F method is constructed as

$$CI_{\theta_j, n}(\text{SBIC}_F) = \left[\widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) - n^{-1/2} z_{bic_s, j}(\alpha/2), \widehat{\theta}_j(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) + n^{-1/2} z_{bic_s, j}(\alpha/2) \right]. \quad (57)$$

Similarly, based on the conclusion in Theorem 2, the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ with SBIC_F method is constructed as

$$CI_{\mu, n}(\text{SBIC}_F) = \left[\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - n^{-1/2} z_{bic}(\alpha/2), \widehat{\mu}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) + n^{-1/2} z_{bic}(\alpha/2) \right], \quad (58)$$

where $z_{bic}(\alpha/2)$ is the $\alpha/2$ quantile of $\dot{\mu} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) \right)^T \widehat{\Sigma} \dot{\mu} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}_s}) \right)$.

4.4 Confidence intervals of Charkhi and Claeskens (2018)

Following Section 3 of Charkhi and Claeskens (2018), we construct the $1 - \alpha$ confidence intervals of the parameters contained in the model selected using AIC. We call this method PAIC and more details can be found in Charkhi and Claeskens (2018). Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{O}$. From Definition 1 of Charkhi and Claeskens (2018), the selection matrix $\zeta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a $|\mathcal{M}| \times q$ matrix with $\{0, 1\}$ elements, constructed as $\zeta_{\mathcal{M}} = (\mathbf{1}_q^T \pi_1^T \pi_1, \dots, \mathbf{1}_q^T \pi_M^T \pi_M)^T$, where $|\mathcal{M}|$ is the number of models and π_m is a $k_m \times q$ matrix that selects those covariates belonging to model m and $\mathbf{1}_q^T$ is a $q \times 1$ vector with each element being 1. Let m_p be the selected model by AIC, $t(m_p)$ be the subvector of vector $t = (t_1, \dots, t_q)^T$ with its subscript consistent with the parameters in the m_p^{th} model, and $\mathcal{F}_{m_p}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ be the corresponding submatrix of the Fisher information matrix $\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. The selection region for model m_p is $\mathcal{A}_{m_p}(\mathcal{O}) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{z} \in \mathbb{R}^q : \left\{ \mathbf{1}_{(|\mathcal{O}|-1)} \otimes (\mathbf{1}_{q_2}^T \pi_M^T \pi_M) - \zeta_{\mathcal{O} \setminus M} \right\} \left\{ (z_1^2 - 2), \dots, (z_q^2 - 2) \right\}^T > 0 \right\}$.

Denote

$$f_{m_p}(t(m_p)) = \phi_{m_p} \left(t(m_p) | \mathcal{A}_{m_p}(\mathcal{O}); J_{m_p}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)$$

as the asymptotic density of $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_{m_p}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0, S_{m_p}})$, a truncated k_{m_p} -dimensional normal density. The quantile of its j^{th} component is obtained via

$$\int_{\mathcal{R}_\alpha} f_{m_p}(t(m_p)) dt(m_p) = 1 - \alpha,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^{k_{mp}}$ restricts only the j^{th} component to $[-q_p(1 - \alpha/2), q_p(1 - \alpha/2)]$. Then the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of θ_j in the selected model based on PAIC method is constructed as

$$\left[\widehat{\theta}_j - n^{-1/2}q_p(1 - \alpha/2), \widehat{\theta}_j + n^{-1/2}q_p(1 - \alpha/2) \right].$$

The calculation of this confidence interval in the simulation is based on the R code provided by Charkhi and Claeskens (2018).

4.5 Confidence intervals based on the full model

In this subsection, we provide one method to construct confidence intervals called FULL. The estimator is the maximum likelihood estimator for the largest model, say the M^{th} model. The $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of θ_j is given by

$$CI_n = \left[\widehat{\theta}_{j,M} - z_{1-\alpha/2}s(\widehat{\theta}_{j,M}), \widehat{\theta}_{j,M} + z_{1-\alpha/2}s(\widehat{\theta}_{j,M}) \right], \quad (59)$$

where $z_{1-\alpha/2}$ is $1 - \alpha/2$ quantile of the standard normal distribution and $s(\widehat{\theta}_{j,M})$ is the standard error computed based on the M^{th} model. The $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is constructed as

$$CI_n = \left[\widehat{\mu}_M - z_{1-\alpha/2}s(\widehat{\mu}_M), \widehat{\mu}_M + z_{1-\alpha/2}s(\widehat{\mu}_M) \right], \quad (60)$$

where $s(\widehat{\mu}_M)$ is the standard error computed based on the M^{th} model.

5 Simulation Study

In this section, based on Theorem 1 and 2 in Section 3, we first study the coverage probabilities of confidence intervals for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ based on scaled S-AIC and scaled S-BIC model averaging estimators in comparison with some other commonly used model averaging approaches under general fixed parameter setup. In this section and next section, Let us take μ as the mean function as an example. Then, we do Q-Q plot to verify that the Λ in previous section approximately follows standard normal distribution. In the following, we present some simulation settings and the results of these.

Consider the following estimators for comparison:

1. Scaled S-AIC estimator with simulation-based confidence intervals (SAIC_F);
2. Scaled S-BIC estimator with simulation-based confidence intervals (SBIC_F);
3. Scaled S-AIC and Scaled S-BIC estimators with the approach in Buckland et al. (1997) (SAIC_{97} and SBIC_{97});
4. Smoothed model-averaged estimators using AIC and BIC with the inference method in Hjort and Claeskens (2003) (SAIC_L and SBIC_L);
5. Post-AIC estimators with the asymptotic distribution conditional on the selected model in Charkhi and Claeskens (2018) (PAIC);
6. Maximum likelihood estimator based on the largest model (FULL).

The confidence intervals for each estimator have been constructed in Section 4.

5.1 Simulation Setup

In this subsection, we present two kinds of simulation settings, one is a linear regression model, the other is a non-linear regression model, Poisson regression model.

5.1.1 Linear regression model

We consider a linear regression model with a finite number of regressors

$$y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\gamma} + e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (1, 1)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (0, 1.5, 0)^T$, $\mathbf{x}_i = (1, x_{i,1})^T$, $\mathbf{z}_i = (z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}, z_{i,3})^T$, $(x_{i,1}, z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}, z_{i,3})^T \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{Q})$. The error term e_i is generated from a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ with $\sigma = 0.5, 1$ and 1.5 . Assume the diagonal elements of \mathbf{Q} are 1, and off-diagonal elements are $\rho^{|i-j|}$, where $\rho = 0.5$ and 0.8 . Set $n = 10, 50$ and 100 and study the confidence intervals for parameters β_1, γ_2 and mean μ .

We tried other different cases of distribution for $(x_{i,1}, z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}, z_{i,3})^T$, including uniform, exponential and mixture distributions. We found that changing distributions of covariates has little effect on

the conclusions. So we only present the result of the normal case.

5.1.2 Poisson regression model

We generate y_i from Poisson distribution with $\lambda_i = p_i$,

$$\log p_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where we set $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (1, 0.5)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (0, 1.2, 0)^T$, and the settings others are the same as those in linear regression model. Let $n = 30, 50$ and 100 and then study the confidence intervals for the same parameters as in Setting 1.

Set $R_0 = 10,000$ and replicate $R = 1,000$ times. For the methods SAIC_F , SBIC_F , SAIC_{97} , SBIC_{97} , SAIC_L , SBIC_L and PAIC, we take $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T)^T$ as our fixed parameter setup. To evaluate the finite sample behavior of each estimator, we report the coverage probability of a nominal 95% confidence interval (CP(95)), and its average length (Len(95)). Specially, for the methods SAIC_F and SBIC_F , we report the results with the true model m_o being known. In practice, the model selected by BIC can be as an estimator of the real model.

5.2 Simulation Results

The performance of methods SAIC_F , SBIC_F , SAIC_{97} , SBIC_{97} , SAIC_L , SBIC_L , PAIC and FULL under Setting 1 and Setting 2 are provided in Tables 1-5, respectively. Because inference post-selection deals with the distributions of the estimators in the selected model, we merely study the confidence intervals of the parameters included in the selected model. For simplicity, we show only the results of these parameters for other methods.

First, let us look at the performance of confidence intervals based on the asymptotic theory of model averaging using AIC and BIC. From Tables 1-5, we can see that the coverage probabilities of SAIC_F achieve the nominal level for most parameters when the sample size is small, such as $n = 10$ for linear regression and $n = 30$ for Poisson regression. As n increases, the coverage

probabilities of SAIC_F achieve the nominal level for all parameters and the length of intervals are also decreasing gradually. The changes of ρ and σ^2 have little effect on its performance. For the performance of SBIC_F , we can find almost the same pattern as SAIC_F in Tables 1-5. As n increases, the coverage probabilities of SBIC_F achieve the nominal level for almost all parameters. However, SBIC_F requires more samples than SAIC_F to achieve the nominal level (see for example the results in Table 5).

Second, when n is large, the coverage probabilities confidence intervals based on SAIC_{97} cannot achieve the nominal level but are near the nominal level, see for example the results in Table 5. While SBIC_{97} achieve the nominal level for all parameters. This verifies our theoretical results in Subsection 4.1. For Setting 1, with the sample size considered here, the coverage probabilities of SAIC_L and SBIC_L achieve the nominal level for all parameters, while the coverage probabilities are very low for Setting 2. The simulation results are also consistent with the theory results in Subsection 4.2. For PAIC, just as the results in Charkhi and Claeskens (2018), when the sample size is small, such as $n = 10$ in Tables 1 and 2, the coverage probabilities of confidence intervals are smaller than the nominal level. For the parameters which are truly non-zero, such as γ_2 , the confidence intervals based on the PAIC method are conservative.

In the following, we compare the performance of the above methods. When n is large, though the coverage probabilities confidence intervals based on SAIC_{97} are near the nominal level and those of SBIC_{97} achieve the nominal level for all parameters, the lengths of those intervals are wider than those of SAIC_F and SBIC_F . In linear regression, the performance of SAIC_{97} and SBIC_{97} is superior to the PAIC method and inferior to other methods when the sample size n is small, such as $n = 10$ in Tables 1 and 2. The coverage probabilities of SAIC_F and SBIC_F are closer to those of SAIC_L and SBIC_L , and both achieve the nominal level. However, in Poisson regression, As explained in Subsection 4.2, SAIC_L and SBIC_L do not work. As shown in Tables 5, the coverage probabilities of SAIC_L and SBIC_L for all parameters are very low and the lengths of their intervals are very short. It means the methods SAIC_L and SBIC_L are invalid in Poisson regression when the true parameters are fixed. Fortunately, other methods perform well except the coverage probabilities of PAIC for γ_2

are very high. All in all, our approaches performs best in most cases.

6 Real-world Data Examples

6.1 A linear regression example

We apply the model averaging methods to cross-country growth regressions considered in Liu (2015), which has nine regressors and a sample size of 74. The challenge of empirical research on economic growth is that one does not know exactly what explanatory variables should be included in the true model. Many studies attempt to identify the variables explaining the differences in growth rates across countries by regressing the average growth rate of GDP per capita on a large set of potentially relevant variables; see Durlauf et al. (2005) for a literature review. We estimate the cross-country growth regression

$$y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\gamma} + e_i,$$

where y_i is average growth rate of GDP per capita between 1960 and 1996, \mathbf{x}_i are the Solow variables from the neoclassical growth theory, and \mathbf{z}_i are fundamental growth determinants such as geography, institutions, religion, and ethnic fractionalization from the new fundamental growth theory. Here, \mathbf{x}_i are core regressors, which appear in every submodel, while \mathbf{z}_i are the auxiliary regressors, which serve as controls of the neoclassical growth theory and may or may not be included in the submodels. We follow Liu (2015) and the setting includes six core regressors and four auxiliary regressors. The six core regressors are the constant term (CONSTANT), the log of GDP per capita in 1960 (GDP60), the 1960C1985 equipment investment share of GDP (EQUIPINV), the primary school enrollment rate in 1960 (SCHOOL60), the life expectancy at age zero in 1960 (LIFE60), and the population growth rate between 1960 and 1990 (DPOP). The four auxiliary regressors are a rule of law index (LAW), a country's fraction of tropical area (TROPICS), an average index of ethnolinguistic fragmentation in a country (AVELF), and the fraction of Confucian population (CONFUC); see Magnus et al. (2010) for a detailed description of the data. The parameter of interest is the convergence term of the Solow growth model, that is, the coefficient of the log GDP per capita in

1960.

We consider all possible submodels, that is, we have 16 submodels. We calculate the confidence intervals of all the methods provided in Section 4. As shown in Table 5, the 95% confidence intervals of the model averaging estimators for GDP60 are very close to that calculated by full model. But the confidence intervals based on the PAIC method are wider than those of other methods. Though all methods are work in this example, it is worth pointing out that the lengths of confidence intervals using $SAIC_F$ and $SBIC_F$ for GDP60 are shorter than those of using other methods, implying that our methods are the best.

Methods	lower	upper	length
$SAIC_F$	-0.0202	-0.0093	0.0109
$SAIC_{97}$	-0.0204	-0.0093	0.0111
$SAIC_L$	-0.0211	-0.0101	0.0110
PAIC	-0.0226	-0.0086	0.0140
$SBIC_F$	-0.0195	-0.0088	0.0107
$SBIC_{97}$	-0.0198	-0.0084	0.0114
$SBIC_L$	-0.0211	-0.0101	0.0110
FULL	-0.0221	-0.0091	0.0129

Table 5: 95% confidence intervals of GDP60.

6.2 A Poisson regression example

In this section, we study the dataset taken from Buckland et al. (1997) (Table 6) and consider a simple multiple regression problem with two correlated explanatory variables, an assumed Poisson error distribution and a log link function. As in Table 6, transect counts of singing males of the songbird *Troglodytes invisibilis* were made on consecutive days. Like in Buckland et al. (1997), we wish to predict future counts, given temperature and wind speed. The problem is to predict the count of on day 19 and we also estimate the count of on day 11.

We consider all possible submodels, that is, the models with temperature alone, with wind speed alone, and with both. We provide the approximate 95% confidence intervals for the expected count

Day	Count	Temperature	Wind speed	Day	Count	Temperature	Wind speed
1	17	22	1.1	11	15	15	3.7
2	45	23	0.5	12	39	22	0.8
3	9	17	2.9	13	18	17	1.7
4	40	22	0.4	14	29	24	0.8
5	18	14	4.8	15	22	13	3.8
6	15	13	3.9	16	10	15	3.1
7	8	14	5.7	17	15	16	2.3
8	21	18	2.6	18	27	22	0.4
9	42	24	0.5	19	??	22	1.5
10	38	26	0.3				

Table 6: Transect counts of a species of songbird in a study area on consecutive days. Covariates temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) and wind speed (m/s) were also recorded.

of day 19 using all the methods in Table 7. As shown in Table 7, the 95% confidence intervals of the model averaging estimators for the expected count of day 19, calculated by the methods in Section 4, are very close to that calculated by full model except the methods SAIC_L and SBIC_L . The length of confidence intervals using SAIC_L and SBIC_L for all parameters are much shorter than that of using full model. We do not know the true count of bird on day 19. If we estimate the count of day 11, from Table 8, we can see that the length of confidence intervals using SAIC_L and SBIC_L are too short to cover the true value. The results of this real example again show that our methods are the best.

Methods	lower	upper	length
SAIC_F	25.2481	29.7033	4.4553
SAIC_{97}	23.4391	31.3837	7.9446
SAIC_L	27.0613	28.5527	1.4915
PAIC	23.8067	28.6063	4.7995
SBIC_F	25.3888	29.2980	3.9093
SBIC_{97}	23.3354	31.3514	8.0161
SBIC_L	27.0613	28.5527	1.4915
FULL	24.2262	31.3878	7.1616

Table 7: 95% confidence intervals of the count on day 19.

Methods	lower	upper	length
SAIC _F	12.1263	16.8850	4.7588
SAIC ₉₇	11.8865	17.3457	5.4592
SAIC _L	14.1297	14.9313	0.8016
PAIC	11.9721	17.2960	5.3240
SBIC _F	12.3243	16.9355	4.6112
SBIC ₉₇	11.8875	17.3723	5.4848
SBIC _L	14.1297	14.9313	0.8016
FULL	11.8843	17.1767	5.2923

Table 8: 95% confidence intervals of the count on day 11.

7 Concluding remarks

Smoothed AIC (S-AIC) and Smoothed BIC (S-BIC) are very widely used in model averaging and are very easily to implement. Buckland et al. (1997) provided an intuitive interval construction method. The resulting coverage probability of their confidence interval is not studied accurately, but it is claimed that it will be close to the intended value. Our derivation in Section 4.1 confirm the validity of their method. In this paper, we study the asymptotic distributions of two commonly used model averaging estimators, the S-AIC and S-BIC estimators, under the general fixed parameter setup. The asymptotic distribution of the scaled S-AIC estimator is a nonlinear function of a normal random vector and that of the scaled S-BIC estimator is a normal distribution. We construct the confidence intervals based on these asymptotic distributions. Besides, we also prove that the confidence interval construction method for the linear function of the parameters in Hjort and Claeskens (2003) still works in linear regression with the normally distributed error. Both the simulation study and real data analysis support our methods.

It is really meaningful to derive the asymptotic distributions of model averaging estimators under general fixed parameter setup. While our results are derived based on SAIC and SBIC weights, the asymptotic theory based on other weight choice criteria may be studied under such parameter setup. These remain for future research.

Appendix A Proof of Lemmas and Theorem

Appendix A.1 Proof of Lemma 1.

When $m \in \mathcal{O}$, the last $q - k_m$ components of the true value $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}$ are 0, and given Conditions (C.1), (C.3) and (C.6), the assumptions of Theorem 18 and Theorem 22 of Ferguson (1996) are satisfied. Expand $l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)$ about $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$:

$$l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) = l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) + \left\{ \dot{l}_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) \right\}^T (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) - n (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)^T I_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0),$$

where $I_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) = -\frac{1}{n} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 v \ddot{l}_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 + uv(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0)) dudv \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, as in the proof of Theorem 18 of Ferguson (1996). In fact, note that $E \left\{ \dot{\Psi}(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \right\}$ is continuous in $\boldsymbol{\theta}_m$ from Condition (C.3)(a). Let $\varepsilon > 0$, so there is exists $\rho > 0$ such that $|\boldsymbol{\theta}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0| < 3\rho$ implies

$$\left| E \left\{ \dot{\Psi}(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) \right\} + \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Next note from the Uniform Strong Law of Large Numbers that with probability 1 there is an integer N such that $n > N$ implies

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_m \in \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_m : |\boldsymbol{\theta}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0| < 3\rho\}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi}(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) - E \left\{ \dot{\Psi}(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Assuming N is so large that $n > N$ implies $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0| < \rho$ and $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0| < \rho$, and then $|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 + uv(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0| < 3\rho$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| I_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right| \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 v \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi} \left\{ y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 + uv(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) \right\} + \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right| dudv \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 v \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_m \in \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_m : |\boldsymbol{\theta}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0| < 3\rho\}} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \dot{\Psi}(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) - E \left\{ \dot{\Psi}(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left| E \left\{ \dot{\Psi}(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m) + \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} \right| \right\} dudv \\ & \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Let $o_{a.s.}(1)$ represent a random variable matrix with each element converging almost surely to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By $\dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-2\log\lambda_{m,n} &= -2 \left\{ l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) \right\} \\
&= 2n \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right)^T I_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \\
&= 2n \left\{ \Pi_m \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \right\}^T \Pi_m I_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \Pi_m^T \Pi_m \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \\
&= 2n \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{0,m} \right)^T I_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m) \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{0,m} \right) \\
&= n \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{0,m} \right)^T \left\{ \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{0,m} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

To find the asymptotic distribution of $\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{0,m} \right)$, expand $\dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)$ about $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) + \frac{1}{n} \Pi_m \int_0^1 \ddot{l}_n \left\{ \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 + v \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \right\} dv \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \\
&= \Pi_m \left\{ -\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \\
&= \Pi_m \left\{ -\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \Pi_m^T \sqrt{n} \Pi_m \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \\
&= \left\{ -\mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{0,m} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{0,m} \right) = - \left\{ \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m})^{-1} + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)$ and

$$-2\log\lambda_{m,n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)^T \Pi_m^T \left\{ \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m})^{-1} + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m). \quad (62)$$

To find the asymptotic distribution of $\Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)$, expand about $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \frac{1}{n} \Pi_m \int_0^1 \ddot{l}_n \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + v \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \right) dv \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right). \quad (63)$$

For the m^{th} sub-model, partition $\mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m})$ into four matrices,

$$\mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) = \begin{pmatrix} k_m \times k_m & k_m \times (q - k_m) \\ Q_{m,1} & Q_{m,2} \\ Q_{m,3} & Q_{m,4} \\ (q - k_m) \times k_m & (q - k_m) \times (q - k_m) \end{pmatrix},$$

and let

$$H_m = \begin{pmatrix} Q_{m,1}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the first k_m components of $\Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)$ are zero, so that $H_m \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) = 0$ and

$$H_m \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = H_m \{ \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) + o_{a.s.}(1) \} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) = \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) + o_{a.s.}(1)$$

since the last $q - k_m$ components of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}'_m$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}$ are equal. Substituting into (63), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) &= \{ I - \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) H_m \} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_{a.s.}(1) \\ &= \{ I - \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T H_m \} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_{a.s.}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

From the Central Limit Theorem,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \sqrt{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \xrightarrow{d} \boldsymbol{\xi},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))$. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \xrightarrow{d} [I - \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T H_m] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi},$$

so that by (62), (64) and $H_m \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T H_m = H_m$,

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log \lambda_{m,n} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \Pi_m^T \{ I - \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) H_m \}^T \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m})^{-1} \\ &\quad \{ I - \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m}) H_m \} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_{a.s.}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \Pi_m^T \{ \mathcal{F}_m(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,m})^{-1} - H_m \} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_{a.s.}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\{ \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\}^T \left[\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} - H_m \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Pi_m \dot{l}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_{a.s.}(1) \\ &= (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{d} (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi})^T \left[\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\kappa}^T \{ \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_m^T \left[\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \{ \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \}^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \\ &\equiv \boldsymbol{\kappa}^T P_m \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\xi} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{q \times q})$. Note that

$$P_m = \{\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Pi_m^T \left[\{\Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T\}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \{\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is a projection and that $\text{rank}(P_m) = \text{trace}(P_m) = q - k_m$. Therefore

$$-2 \log \lambda_{m,n} \xrightarrow{d} \boldsymbol{\kappa}^T P_m \boldsymbol{\kappa} \sim \chi^2(q - k_m).$$

Appendix A.2 Proof of Lemma 2.

For any underfitted model $m \in \mathcal{U}$, under Conditions (C.1),(C.2) and Conditions (C.3)(b)-(C.5), the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 3.2 of White (1982) are satisfied. Then, we have

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \quad (66)$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left(0, C_m \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) \right). \quad (67)$$

Moreover, $C_{m,n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} \right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} C_m \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right)$. By the Taylor's Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l_n \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \right) &= \sum_{t=1}^n \log f \left(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \right) \\ &= l_n \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* \right) + \sum_{t=1}^n \Psi \left(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* \right) \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{n}{2} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* \right)^T A_n \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m + \alpha \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \right) \right) \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* \right) \\ &= l_n \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* \right) + \sum_{t=1}^n \Psi_m \left(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{n}{2} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right)^T A_{m,n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} + \alpha \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} \right) \right) \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right), \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. In fact, given Conditions (C.1)-(C.2) and (C.3)(b)-(C.5), from the proof of Theorem 3.2 of White (1982), we have $E \{ \Psi_m \left(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) \} = 0$, and by Laws of Large Numbers, we have

$$n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \Psi_m \left(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) \xrightarrow{p} E \{ \Psi_m \left(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) \}, \quad (69)$$

and

$$n^{-1}l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*) = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*) \xrightarrow{p} E \{ \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*) \}. \quad (70)$$

We also have

$$A_{m,n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} + \alpha \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} \right) \right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} A_m \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) \quad (71)$$

by Theorem 2.2 of White (1982). Then, using results (66)-(71), we can conclude that

$$n^{-1}l_n \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \right) = E \{ \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*) \} + o_p(1).$$

Appendix A.3 Proof of Lemma 3.

From Lemma 1, when $m \in \mathcal{O}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -2\log\lambda_{m,n} &= -2 \left\{ l_n \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \right) - l_n \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \right\} \\ &= \left(\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \right)^T \left[\left\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \Pi_m^T \right\}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_{a.s.}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m_o}^{-1} &= \exp \left(\text{AIC}_{m_o} / 2 - \text{AIC}_m / 2 \right) \\ &= \exp \left\{ - \sum_{t=1}^n \log f \left(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m_o} \right) + \sum_{t=1}^n \log f \left(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \right) + k_{m_o} - k_m \right\} \\ &= \exp \left[- \log \left\{ \prod_{t=1}^n f \left(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m_o} \right) / \prod_{t=1}^n f \left(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \log \left\{ \prod_{t=1}^n f \left(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \right) / \prod_{t=1}^n f \left(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 \right) \right\} + k_{m_o} - k_m \right] \\ &= \exp \left\{ \left(-2\log\lambda_{m_o,n} + 2\log\lambda_{m,n} \right) / 2 + k_{m_o} - k_m \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \left(\left(\Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \right)^T \left[\left\{ \Pi_{m_o} \mathcal{F} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \Pi_{m_o}^T \right\}^{-1} - H_{m_o} \right] \Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \left(\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \right)^T \left[\left\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F} \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \Pi_m^T \right\}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \right) / 2 + k_{m_o} - k_m \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} = \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m_o}^{-1} / \sum_{m=1}^M \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m_o}^{-1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \exp \left\{ \left((\Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[\{ \Pi_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_{m_o}^T \}^{-1} - H_{m_o} \right] \Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n - (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \left[\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \right) / 2 + k_{m_o} - k_m \right\} \\
&\quad / \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \exp \left\{ \left((\Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[\{ \Pi_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_{m_o}^T \}^{-1} - H_{m_o} \right] \Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \right) / 2 + k_{m_o} - k_m \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m_o}^{-1} \right]. \tag{74}
\end{aligned}$$

However, when $m \in \mathcal{U}$, from Lemma 2, we have

$$n^{-1} l_n \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \right) = \text{E} \{ \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*) \} + o_p(1). \tag{75}$$

Similarly, from the proof of Lemma 2, we can prove that

$$n^{-1} l_n \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m_o} \right) = \text{E} \{ \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \} + o_p(1). \tag{76}$$

By $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*$ and the definition of KLIC, we conclude that there is $\delta_m > 0$ so that

$$\text{E} \{ \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \} - \text{E} \{ \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*) \} = \delta_m. \tag{77}$$

Thus, when $m \in \mathcal{U}$, by (75)-(77), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m_o}^{-1} = \exp(\text{AIC}_{m_o}/2 - \text{AIC}_m/2) \\
&= \exp \left\{ - \sum_{t=1}^n \log f(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m_o}) + \sum_{t=1}^n \log f(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) + k_{m_o} - k_m \right\} \\
&= \exp \left[-n \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \log f(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m_o}) - n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \log f(y_t, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \right\} + k_{m_o} - k_m \right] \\
&= \exp \left[-n \left\{ n^{-1} l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m_o}) - n^{-1} l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \right\} + k_{m_o} - k_m \right] \\
&= \{ \exp(-n) \}^{\{ \delta_m + o_p(1) + (k_{m_o} - k_m)/n \}} \\
&= O_p(e^{-n\delta_m}) \xrightarrow{p} 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \tag{78}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC}} \in \mathcal{W}$, (78) implies that

$$\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} = O_p(e^{-n\delta_m}) \tag{79}$$

and then when $m \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (80)$$

Define $\delta = \min_{m \in \mathcal{U}} \delta_m$, thus we can conclude that

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m_o}^{-1} = O_p(e^{-n\delta}) = o_p(1).$$

By (74), when $m \in \mathcal{O}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} &= \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m_o}^{-1} / \sum_{m=1}^M \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m_o}^{-1} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \left((\Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[\{ \Pi_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_{m_o}^T \}^{-1} - H_{m_o} \right] \Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n - (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left[\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \right) / 2 + k_{m_o} - k_m \right\} \\ &\quad / \left[\sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \exp \left\{ \left((\Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[\{ \Pi_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_{m_o}^T \}^{-1} - H_{m_o} \right] \Pi_{m_o} \boldsymbol{\xi}_n \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. - (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[\{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} - H_m \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_{a.s.}(1) \right) / 2 + k_{m_o} - k_m \right\} + o_p(1) \right] \\ &= \exp \left\{ (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n / 2 - k_m + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \\ &\quad / \left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \exp \left((\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n / 2 - k_m + o_p(1) \right) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} \exp \left\{ (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi})^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi} / 2 - k_m \right\} \\ &\quad / \left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \exp \left\{ (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi})^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi} / 2 - k_m \right\} \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} \}^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} / 2 - k_m \right\} \\ &\quad / \left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \exp \left\{ \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} \}^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} / 2 - k_m \right\} \right\} \\ &= G_m / \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} G_m = G_m / G, \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

where

$$G_m = \exp \left\{ \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} \}^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} / 2 - k_m \right\},$$

$\boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))$ and $G = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} G_m$.

Combining (80) and (81), by Theorem 6 in Ferguson (1996), we have

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}} \xrightarrow{d} \boldsymbol{w}_{\text{AIC}},$$

where $\boldsymbol{w}_{\text{AIC}}$ is a $M \times 1$ vector with the m^{th} element $w_{\text{AIC},m} = \mathbf{1}\{m \in \mathcal{O}\}G_m / \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} G_m$.

Similarly, we can obtain that for any overfitted model m and $m \neq m_o$,

$$\widehat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC},m_o}^{-1} = O_p(1) \cdot n^{(k_{m_o} - k_m)/2} \xrightarrow{p} 0,$$

and that for any underfitted model $m \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC},m_o}^{-1} &= \{\exp(-n)\}^{n^{-1}l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m_o}) - n^{-1}l_n(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)} n^{(k_{m_o} - k_m)/2} \\ &= \{\exp(-n)\}^{\{\delta_m + o_p(1)\}} n^{(k_{m_o} - k_m)/2} \\ &= \{\exp(-n)\}^{\{\delta_m + o_p(1)\}} n^{(k_{m_o} - k_m)/2} \\ &= O_p(e^{-n\delta_m}) = o_p(1). \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

From the above two formulas, we have $\boldsymbol{w}_{\text{BIC}} \xrightarrow{p} \boldsymbol{w}_{m_o}^o$.

Appendix A.4 Proof of Lemma 4.

Since Θ is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^q and by Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 3.2 of White (1982), we can conclude that for any sub-model m ,

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* = O(1), \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = O(1), \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*, \tag{83}$$

$$\text{and } \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) = -A_m^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^*) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} + o_p(1). \tag{84}$$

When $m \in \mathcal{O}$, we have $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,S_m}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. Then, by Theorem 3.3 of White (1982), we have $-A_m^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^*) = Q_{m,1}^{-1}$. Further,

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right) = Q_{m,1}^{-1} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} \right\} + o_p(1). \tag{85}$$

From the proof of Lemma 1, we conclude that

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} \right\} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_{m,n} \xrightarrow{d} \boldsymbol{\zeta}_m,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_m \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, Q_{m,1})$. And by (79) in Lemma 3, Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right\} &= \sum_{m=1}^M \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} O_p(e^{-n\delta_m}) \sqrt{n} O_p(1) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) + O_p(e^{-n\delta}) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* \right) + o_p(1) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \Pi_m^{-1} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m' - \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^{\prime*} \right) + o_p(1) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \Pi_m^T \left\{ \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m}^T, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T - \left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^{*T}, \mathbf{0}^T \right)^T \right\} + o_p(1) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \Pi_m^T \left(\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{S_m} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}^* \right)^T, \mathbf{0}_{q-k_m}^T \right)^T + o_p(1) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \Pi_m^T \begin{pmatrix} G_{S_m,1}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\partial \log f(y_t, \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{S_m}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + o_p(1) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_p(1). \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

By (81), note that $\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m}$ is also the function of random vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}_n$. Then we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_p(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{d} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} (G_m/G) \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}. \end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Similarly, we can prove that

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \\
&= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \\
&= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} O_p \left(e^{-n\delta_m} \right) \sqrt{n} O_p(1) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \\
&= O_p \left(e^{-n\delta} \right) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \\
&= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) + o_p(1) \\
&\stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} \Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}, \tag{88}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{m_o})$$

with

$$\Sigma_{m_o} = \Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \left(\Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o} \right)^T.$$

By the definition of Δ_{m_o} and because the m_o^{th} candidate model is the true model, when $j \notin S_{m_o}$, it means $\theta_{j,0} = 0$. Suppose σ_{j,m_o}^2 is the j^{th} element on the diagonal of matrix Σ_{m_o} , then $\sigma_{j,m_o}^2 = 0$. We can conclude that $\hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) \xrightarrow{p} \theta_{j,0} = 0$. On the other hand, for $j \in S_{m_o}$,

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_j(\hat{\boldsymbol{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - \theta_{j,0} \right\} \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} Z_j,$$

where $Z_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{j,m_o}^2)$.

Appendix A.5 Proof of Theorem 2.

From the proof of Lemma 4, for any sub-model m ,

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^* = O(1), \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = O(1), \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \xrightarrow{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*. \tag{89}$$

$\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is continuous so that we have

$$\mu(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*). \tag{90}$$

When $m \in \mathcal{U}$, from the proof of Lemma 3, we conclude that

$$\widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} = O_p(e^{-n\delta_m}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} = O_p(e^{-n\delta_m}). \quad (91)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \mu(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \mu(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*) + \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_m^*) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{U}} O_p(e^{-n\delta_m}) \sqrt{n} O_p(1) \\ &= O_p(e^{-n\delta}) = o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

When $m \in \mathcal{O}$, from the proof of Lemma 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} &= \exp \left\{ (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n / 2 - k_m + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} \\ & \quad / \left\{ \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \exp \left\{ (\Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n)^T \left[H_m - \{ \Pi_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \Pi_m^T \}^{-1} \right] \Pi_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n / 2 - k_m + o_{a.s.}(1) \right\} + o_p(1) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_p(1). \quad (94)$$

By the theorem's proof in Subsection 3.1 in Van der Vaart (2000),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n} \left\{ \mu(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} \\ &= \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_p(1) \\ &= \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \boldsymbol{\xi}_n + o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \widehat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \mu(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} (G_m / G) \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Combing (92) and (96), we can draw the following conclusion,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n} \{ \hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{AIC}}) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \} \\
&= \sum_{m=1}^M \hat{w}_{\text{AIC},m} \sqrt{n} \left\{ \mu(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right\} \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} (G_m/G) \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \Pi_m^T H_{S_m} \Pi_m \Delta_m \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Naturally, by the similar proof technique, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n} \{ \hat{\mu}(\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\text{BIC}}) - \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \} &= \sum_{m \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_{\text{BIC},m} \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \sqrt{n} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_p(1) \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \dot{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \Pi_{m_o}^T H_{S_{m_o}} \Pi_{m_o} \Delta_{m_o} \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \boldsymbol{\eta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

References

- H Akaike. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In *International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 267–281, 1973.
- S. T. Buckland, K. P. Burnham, and N. H. Augustin. Model selection: An integral part of inference. *Biometrics*, 53(2):603–618, 1997.
- Kenneth P. Burnham and David R. Anderson. *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretical Approach*. Springer New York, 2002.
- Kenneth P Burnham and David R Anderson. Multimodel inference: understanding aic and bic in model selection. *Sociological methods & research*, 33(2):261–304, 2004.
- Ali Charkhi and Gerda Claeskens. Asymptotic post-selection inference for the akaike information criterion. *Biometrika*, 105(3):645–664, 2018. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asy018. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asy018>.
- Gerda Claeskens and Nils Lid Hjort. *Model Selection and Model Averaging*. Cambridge University Press,, 2008.

- Francis J. DiTraglia. Using invalid instruments on purpose: Focused moment selection and averaging for gmm . *Journal of Econometrics*, 195(2):187–208, 2016.
- Steven N. Durlauf, Paul A. Johnson, and Jonathan R. W. Temple. Growth econometrics. *Handbook of Economic Growth*, 1(05):555–677, 2005.
- Thomas S. Ferguson. *A course in large sample theory*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1996. ISBN 0-412-04371-8.
- Bruce E Hansen. Least squares model averaging. *Econometrica*, 75(4):1175–1189, 2007.
- Bruce E. Hansen. Averaging estimators for regressions with a possible structural break. *Econometric Theory*, 25(6):1498–1514, 2009.
- Bruce E. Hansen. Averaging estimators for autoregressions with a near unit root. *Journal of Econometrics*, 158(1):142–155, 2010.
- Bruce E Hansen and Jeffrey S Racine. Jackknife model averaging. *Journal of Econometrics*, 167(1):38–46, 2012.
- Nils Lid Hjort and Gerda Claeskens. Frequentist model average estimators. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(464):879–899, 2003.
- Solomon Kullback and Richard A Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 22(1):79–86, 1951.
- David F Layton and S Todd Lee. Embracing model uncertainty: strategies for response pooling and model averaging. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 34(1):51–85, 2006.
- Gilbert Leung and Andrew R Barron. Information theory and mixing least-squares regressions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(8):3396–3410, 2006.
- Chu An Liu. Distribution theory of the least squares averaging estimator. *Journal of Econometrics*, 186(1):142–159, 2015.

- Xun Lu. A covariate selection criterion for estimation of treatment effects. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 33(4):506–522, 2015.
- Jan R. Magnus, Owen Powell, and Patricia Prfer. A comparison of two model averaging techniques with an application to growth empirics. *Journal of Econometrics*, 154(2):139–153, 2010.
- Priyam Mitra, Heng Lian, Ritwik Mitra, Hua Liang, and Min-ge Xie. A general framework for frequentist model averaging. *Science China Mathematics*, 62(2):205–226, Feb 2019.
- Benedikt M. Pötscher. The distribution of model averaging estimators and an impossibility result regarding its estimation. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 52:113–129, 2006.
- A. E. Raftery and Y. Zheng. Discussion: Performance of bayesian model averaging. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(1):931–938, 2003.
- A. Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Halbert White. Maximum likelihood estimation of misspecified models. *Econometrica*, 50(1):1–25, 1982.
- Xinyu Zhang and Chu-An Liu. Inference after model averaging in linear regression models. *Econometric Theory*, page to appear, 2018.

Methods	$\sigma = 0.5$			$\sigma = 1$			$\sigma = 1.5$			
	β_0	β_1	μ	β_0	β_1	μ	β_0	β_1	μ	
CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.919	0.918	0.929	0.916	0.909	0.919	0.899	0.947	0.919
	SAIC ₉₇	0.884	0.888	0.918	0.872	0.872	0.913	0.870	0.909	0.916
	SAIC _L	0.931	0.946	0.950	0.930	0.937	0.944	0.916	0.959	0.949
	PAIC	0.800	0.788	0.835	0.749	0.748	0.814	0.728	0.763	0.793
	SBIC _F	0.902	0.892	0.856	0.897	0.863	0.839	0.876	0.918	0.841
	SBIC ₉₇	0.883	0.890	0.918	0.872	0.873	0.912	0.872	0.913	0.914
	SBIC _L	0.931	0.946	0.950	0.930	0.937	0.944	0.916	0.959	0.949
	FULL	0.893	0.891	0.898	0.886	0.883	0.892	0.866	0.904	0.895
Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.7962	0.9606	1.6436	1.5786	1.8568	3.1849	2.3578	2.7960	4.7358
	SAIC ₉₇	0.7277	0.8909	1.6754	1.4500	1.7406	3.2627	2.1794	2.6141	4.8475
	SAIC _L	0.8913	1.1425	2.0703	1.7584	2.2072	4.0190	2.6415	3.2808	5.9535
	PAIC	0.5382	0.6445	1.2529	1.0581	1.2409	2.3867	1.5755	1.8592	3.5171
	SBIC _F	0.7412	0.8405	1.3017	1.4730	1.6226	2.5035	2.1927	2.4674	3.7725
	SBIC ₉₇	0.7232	0.8824	1.6506	1.4452	1.7293	3.2236	2.1731	2.5994	4.7914
	SBIC _L	0.8913	1.1425	2.0703	1.7584	2.2072	4.0190	2.6415	3.2808	5.9535
	FULL	0.8190	1.0513	1.8965	1.5976	2.0065	3.6554	2.3914	2.9755	5.3714

Table 1: Coverage Probability and Length of 95% confidence intervals (CP(95) and Len(95)): Linear regression, $n = 10$, $\rho = 0.5$.

Methods	$\sigma = 0.5$			$\sigma = 1$			$\sigma = 1.5$			
	β_0	β_1	μ	β_0	β_1	μ	β_0	β_1	μ	
CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.927	0.929	0.903	0.924	0.924	0.919	0.916	0.917	0.902
	SAIC ₉₇	0.888	0.903	0.912	0.879	0.897	0.906	0.871	0.886	0.887
	SAIC _L	0.940	0.952	0.950	0.935	0.951	0.955	0.934	0.955	0.944
	PAIC	0.775	0.792	0.795	0.778	0.764	0.777	0.739	0.742	0.733
	SBIC _F	0.905	0.862	0.822	0.910	0.864	0.843	0.889	0.852	0.825
	SBIC ₉₇	0.887	0.900	0.912	0.878	0.894	0.905	0.872	0.884	0.884
	SBIC _L	0.940	0.952	0.950	0.935	0.951	0.955	0.934	0.955	0.944
	FULL	0.897	0.901	0.882	0.886	0.903	0.901	0.878	0.884	0.871
Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.8022	1.2875	1.6250	1.5776	2.5101	3.1716	2.3524	3.7287	4.7741
	SAIC ₉₇	0.7363	1.2316	1.6913	1.4461	2.3762	3.2138	2.1309	3.4837	4.7235
	SAIC _L	0.8966	1.6026	2.0575	1.7602	3.1275	3.9895	2.6425	4.6764	6.0432
	PAIC	0.5432	0.9131	1.2463	1.0473	1.7203	2.2909	1.5466	2.5100	3.3704
	SBIC _F	0.7455	1.0578	1.2719	1.4700	2.0625	2.5170	2.1728	3.0253	3.7600
	SBIC ₉₇	0.7329	1.2194	1.6697	1.4406	2.3540	3.1747	2.1229	3.4515	4.6586
	SBIC _L	0.8966	1.6026	2.0575	1.7602	3.1275	3.9895	2.6425	4.6764	6.0432
	FULL	0.8176	1.4679	1.8765	1.6022	2.8476	3.6119	2.3816	4.2121	5.4696

Table 2: Coverage Probability and Length of 95% confidence intervals (CP(95) and Len(95)): Linear regression, $n = 10$, $\rho = 0.8$.

n	Methods	$\sigma = 0.5$			$\sigma = 1$			$\sigma = 1.5$			
		β_1	γ_2	μ	β_1	γ_2	μ	β_1	γ_2	μ	
50	CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.944	0.942	0.954	0.946	0.938	0.951	0.933	0.941	0.945
		SAIC ₉₇	0.950	0.954	0.965	0.952	0.947	0.964	0.938	0.954	0.953
		SAIC _L	0.949	0.944	0.961	0.954	0.939	0.944	0.938	0.945	0.955
		PAIC	0.944	0.979	0.975	0.948	0.984	0.973	0.935	0.989	0.967
		SBIC _F	0.937	0.931	0.943	0.942	0.929	0.933	0.928	0.931	0.929
		SBIC ₉₇	0.951	0.953	0.965	0.952	0.947	0.967	0.940	0.955	0.957
		SBIC _L	0.949	0.944	0.961	0.954	0.939	0.944	0.938	0.945	0.955
		FULL	0.939	0.938	0.956	0.947	0.933	0.942	0.931	0.942	0.947
	Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.3107	0.3302	0.5346	0.6268	0.6654	1.0979	0.9473	0.9930	1.6533
		SAIC ₉₇	0.3143	0.3387	0.5537	0.6331	0.6853	1.1349	0.9598	1.0221	1.7118
		SAIC _L	0.3370	0.3791	0.6212	0.6806	0.7640	1.2779	1.0281	1.1415	1.9283
		PAIC	0.3111	0.4271	0.6142	0.6257	0.8674	1.2629	0.9488	1.2935	1.8814
		SBIC _F	0.2948	0.2963	0.4668	0.5948	0.6000	0.9562	0.9001	0.8914	1.4282
		SBIC ₉₇	0.3067	0.3237	0.5245	0.6177	0.6551	1.0732	0.9371	0.9774	1.6191
SBIC _L		0.3370	0.3791	0.6212	0.6806	0.7640	1.2779	1.0281	1.1415	1.9283	
FULL		0.3330	0.3746	0.6137	0.6730	0.7556	1.2640	1.0158	1.1279	1.9053	
100	CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.944	0.936	0.939	0.955	0.939	0.948	0.945	0.942	0.952
		SAIC ₉₇	0.947	0.957	0.953	0.964	0.957	0.971	0.951	0.957	0.975
		SAIC _L	0.948	0.947	0.942	0.956	0.947	0.953	0.946	0.950	0.952
		PAIC	0.938	0.990	0.968	0.957	0.989	0.976	0.947	0.990	0.978
		SBIC _F	0.938	0.926	0.925	0.955	0.932	0.930	0.946	0.936	0.942
		SBIC ₉₇	0.942	0.954	0.960	0.959	0.953	0.962	0.952	0.955	0.972
		SBIC _L	0.948	0.947	0.942	0.956	0.947	0.953	0.946	0.950	0.952
		FULL	0.946	0.945	0.941	0.955	0.946	0.951	0.946	0.947	0.949
	Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.2165	0.2284	0.3762	0.4339	0.4562	0.7491	0.6507	0.6908	1.1201
		SAIC ₉₇	0.2203	0.2370	0.3924	0.4415	0.4718	0.7732	0.6631	0.7137	1.1579
		SAIC _L	0.2333	0.2610	0.4337	0.4683	0.5226	0.8689	0.7028	0.7876	1.2983
		PAIC	0.2173	0.2990	0.4410	0.4341	0.5935	0.8579	0.6538	0.9019	1.2906
		SBIC _F	0.2063	0.2068	0.3310	0.4139	0.4120	0.6524	0.6210	0.6245	0.9773
		SBIC ₉₇	0.2136	0.2236	0.3658	0.4278	0.4442	0.7195	0.6433	0.6733	1.0750
SBIC _L		0.2333	0.2610	0.4337	0.4683	0.5226	0.8689	0.7028	0.7876	1.2983	
FULL		0.2320	0.2595	0.4311	0.4660	0.5201	0.8647	0.6991	0.7834	1.2915	

Table 3: Coverage Probability and Length of 95% confidence intervals (CP(95) and Len(95)): Linear regression, $\rho = 0.5$.

n	Methods	$\sigma = 0.5$			$\sigma = 1$			$\sigma = 1.5$			
		β_1	γ_2	μ	β_1	γ_2	μ	β_1	γ_2	μ	
50	CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.943	0.945	0.936	0.956	0.936	0.927	0.952	0.947	0.948
		SAIC ₉₇	0.949	0.962	0.956	0.961	0.960	0.946	0.962	0.971	0.959
		SAIC _L	0.953	0.957	0.943	0.956	0.944	0.935	0.950	0.954	0.960
		PAIC	0.950	0.983	0.972	0.965	0.983	0.966	0.959	0.994	0.966
		SBIC _F	0.924	0.895	0.923	0.934	0.892	0.914	0.924	0.911	0.926
		SBIC ₉₇	0.950	0.965	0.954	0.960	0.968	0.950	0.956	0.968	0.958
		SBIC _L	0.953	0.957	0.943	0.956	0.944	0.935	0.950	0.954	0.960
		FULL	0.947	0.953	0.938	0.952	0.938	0.932	0.944	0.945	0.957
	Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.4236	0.4912	0.5408	0.8448	0.9822	1.0798	1.2686	1.4739	1.6413
		SAIC ₉₇	0.4334	0.5152	0.5559	0.8673	1.0367	1.1148	1.3091	1.5533	1.7212
		SAIC _L	0.4911	0.6313	0.6319	0.9830	1.2643	1.2611	1.4720	1.8881	1.9103
		PAIC	0.4430	0.5898	0.6126	0.8848	1.1935	1.2311	1.3318	1.7733	1.8737
		SBIC _F	0.3751	0.3747	0.4674	0.7466	0.7464	0.9339	1.1293	1.1284	1.4266
		SBIC ₉₇	0.4115	0.4665	0.5235	0.8240	0.9397	1.0537	1.2517	1.4080	1.6437
SBIC _L		0.4911	0.6313	0.6319	0.9830	1.2643	1.2611	1.4720	1.8881	1.9103	
FULL		0.4863	0.6250	0.6256	0.9722	1.2502	1.2474	1.4564	1.8682	1.8897	
100	CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.947	0.944	0.944	0.951	0.950	0.950	0.957	0.948	0.940
		SAIC ₉₇	0.963	0.974	0.954	0.970	0.968	0.961	0.962	0.976	0.953
		SAIC _L	0.951	0.951	0.948	0.946	0.952	0.953	0.959	0.950	0.949
		PAIC	0.963	0.990	0.969	0.968	0.983	0.967	0.958	0.992	0.970
		SBIC _F	0.937	0.916	0.923	0.944	0.925	0.927	0.939	0.919	0.927
		SBIC ₉₇	0.958	0.978	0.957	0.964	0.965	0.959	0.960	0.969	0.950
		SBIC _L	0.951	0.951	0.948	0.946	0.952	0.953	0.959	0.950	0.949
		FULL	0.950	0.944	0.945	0.941	0.948	0.951	0.952	0.943	0.947
	Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.2936	0.3381	0.3851	0.5808	0.6747	0.7526	0.8797	1.0155	1.1435
		SAIC ₉₇	0.3037	0.3575	0.3971	0.6010	0.7190	0.7787	0.9091	1.0829	1.1810
		SAIC _L	0.3387	0.4326	0.4463	0.6712	0.8628	0.8684	1.0131	1.2991	1.3296
		PAIC	0.3102	0.4067	0.4389	0.6157	0.8286	0.8712	0.9303	1.2464	1.3101
		SBIC _F	0.2615	0.2610	0.3361	0.5193	0.5181	0.6614	0.7848	0.7830	0.9920
		SBIC ₉₇	0.2841	0.3137	0.3695	0.5631	0.6315	0.7267	0.8512	0.9497	1.0961
SBIC _L		0.3387	0.4326	0.4463	0.6712	0.8628	0.8684	1.0131	1.2991	1.3296	
FULL		0.3370	0.4304	0.4440	0.6674	0.8577	0.8635	1.0077	1.2922	1.3225	

Table 4: Coverage Probability and Length of 95% confidence intervals (CP(95) and Len(95)): Linear regression, $\rho = 0.8$.

n	Methods	$\rho = 0.5$			$\rho = 0.8$			
		β_1	γ_2	μ	β_1	γ_2	μ	
30	CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.943	0.942	0.933	0.944	0.957	0.927
		SAIC ₉₇	0.960	0.959	0.948	0.963	0.979	0.948
		SAIC _L	0.282	0.228	0.205	0.240	0.251	0.233
		PAIC	0.957	0.990	0.973	0.956	0.992	0.974
		SBIC _F	0.933	0.925	0.919	0.919	0.904	0.910
		SBIC ₉₇	0.962	0.957	0.949	0.959	0.974	0.947
		SBIC _L	0.285	0.217	0.210	0.241	0.249	0.240
		FULL	0.950	0.944	0.932	0.949	0.952	0.935
	Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.3946	0.4488	4.8367	0.5094	0.6178	5.7910
		SAIC ₉₇	0.4083	0.4689	5.0453	0.5315	0.6528	5.9100
		SAIC _L	0.0733	0.0777	1.0429	0.1085	0.1309	1.2440
		PAIC	0.4010	0.5753	5.8368	0.5268	0.7212	6.8963
		SBIC _F	0.3610	0.3943	3.9774	0.4288	0.4584	4.7257
		SBIC ₉₇	0.3957	0.4496	4.7583	0.5034	0.6007	5.5382
SBIC _L		0.0733	0.0777	1.0429	0.1085	0.1309	1.2440	
FULL		0.4468	0.5281	5.9641	0.6203	0.8077	7.0149	
50	CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.935	0.940	0.935	0.960	0.950	0.946
		SAIC ₉₇	0.952	0.958	0.946	0.971	0.981	0.959
		SAIC _L	0.214	0.165	0.173	0.231	0.196	0.207
		PAIC	0.949	0.984	0.965	0.973	0.992	0.974
		SBIC _F	0.931	0.927	0.920	0.939	0.915	0.929
		SBIC ₉₇	0.953	0.950	0.947	0.974	0.980	0.958
		SBIC _L	0.213	0.164	0.178	0.228	0.191	0.205
		FULL	0.937	0.941	0.935	0.960	0.956	0.948
	Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.2743	0.3110	4.1097	0.3474	0.4141	5.4156
		SAIC ₉₇	0.2828	0.3235	4.2536	0.3621	0.4352	5.5940
		SAIC _L	0.0400	0.0429	0.6725	0.0568	0.0686	0.8760
		PAIC	0.2800	0.4037	4.9884	0.3644	0.4877	6.4575
		SBIC _F	0.2561	0.2781	3.5754	0.2983	0.3130	4.6923
		SBIC ₉₇	0.2734	0.3081	4.0233	0.3390	0.3921	5.2512
SBIC _L		0.0400	0.0429	0.6725	0.0568	0.0686	0.8760	
FULL		0.3036	0.3586	4.7645	0.4144	0.5329	6.4744	
100	CP(95)	SAIC _F	0.951	0.958	0.939	0.944	0.947	0.942
		SAIC ₉₇	0.964	0.972	0.957	0.963	0.969	0.964
		SAIC _L	0.148	0.129	0.140	0.163	0.163	0.135
		PAIC	0.959	0.998	0.970	0.966	0.986	0.978
		SBIC _F	0.953	0.947	0.926	0.935	0.915	0.945
		SBIC ₉₇	0.962	0.963	0.959	0.959	0.969	0.961
		SBIC _L	0.150	0.132	0.141	0.157	0.153	0.138
		FULL	0.953	0.967	0.941	0.954	0.951	0.950
	Len(95)	SAIC _F	0.1780	0.1960	2.3035	0.2199	0.2616	2.4519
		SAIC ₉₇	0.1836	0.2044	2.4338	0.2287	0.2779	2.5435
		SAIC _L	0.0185	0.0201	0.2789	0.0253	0.0310	0.2974
		PAIC	0.1822	0.2556	2.7329	0.2358	0.3129	2.7757
		SBIC _F	0.1682	0.1760	1.9549	0.1934	0.1990	2.0850
		SBIC ₉₇	0.1766	0.1918	2.2195	0.2124	0.2417	2.3300
SBIC _L		0.0185	0.0201	0.2789	0.0253	0.0310	0.2974	
FULL		0.1950	0.2253	2.7357	0.2573	0.3349	2.8827	

Table 5: Coverage Probability and Length of 95% confidence intervals (CP(95) and Len(95)): Poisson regression.