

Principal component analysis of periodically correlated functional time series

Lukasz Kidziński

Stanford University

Piotr Kokoszka*

Colorado State University

Neda Mohammadi Jouzdani

Colorado State University

Abstract

Within the framework of functional data analysis, we develop principal component analysis for periodically correlated time series of functions. We define the components of the above analysis including periodic, operator-valued filters, score processes and the inversion formulas. We show that these objects are defined via convergent series under a simple condition requiring summability of the Hilbert–Schmidt norms of the filter coefficients, and that they poses optimality properties. We explain how the Hilbert space theory reduces to an approximate finite-dimensional setting which is implemented in a custom build R package. A data example and a simulation study show that the new methodology is superior to existing tools if the functional time series exhibit periodic characteristics.

Keywords: Functional time series, Periodically correlated time series, Principal components, Spectral analysis.

1 Introduction

Periodicity is one of the most important characteristics of time series, with early work going back to the very origins of the field, e.g. Walker (1914) and Fisher (1929). The class of periodically correlated time series is particularly suitable to quantify periodic behavior reflected not only in the mean structure but also in correlations. Consequently, periodically correlated (PC) time series have been used in many modeling and prediction applications and various aspects of their theory have been studied. The book of Hurd and Miamee (2007) gives an account of the subject. It is impossible to list even a fraction of relevant references, but to indicate the many flavors of work done in this field we cite Hurd

*Supported by NSF grant DMS 1462067.

(1989), Lund *et al.* (1995), Anderson and Meerschaert (1997), Javorskyj *et al.* (2012) and Ghanbarzadeh and Aminghafari (2016).

The last decade has seen increased interest in time series of curves, often referred to as functional time series (FTS's). Examples of FTS's include annual temperature or smoothed precipitation curves, e.g. Gromenko *et al.* (2016), daily pollution level curves, e.g. Aue *et al.* (2015), various daily curves derived from high frequency asset price data, e.g. Horváth *et al.* (2014), yield curves, e.g. Hays *et al.* (2012), daily vehicle traffic curves, e.g. Klepsch *et al.* (2017). Other examples are given in the books of Horváth and Kokoszka (2012) and Kokoszka and Reimherr (2017). The theory and methodology of FTS's forms a subfield of Functional Data Analysis (FDA). A key tool of FDA is dimension reduction via functional principal component analysis (FPCA), e.g. Chapter 3 of Horváth and Kokoszka (2012). FPCA has been developed for random samples of functions, i.e for iid functional data. Recently, Hörmann *et al.* (2015) extended the theory of Brillinger (1975), Chapter 9, from the setting linear vector-valued time series to functional weakly dependent time series. Building on earlier advances of Panaretos and Tavakoli (2013b, 2013a), they developed spectral domain PCA which leads to a better representation of stationary FTS's than the usual (static) PCA. Suitable details and definitions are given in Section 2. The objective of this paper is to develop PCA for periodically correlated FTS's. We establish the requisite theoretical framework and show that for FTS's with periodic characteristics the new approach is superior to the methodology of Hörmann *et al.* (2015). We emphasize that the latter methodology was developed for stationary FTS's and so is a priori not well suited for periodic functional data. Tests for periodicity in FTS's have recently been developed by Hörmann *et al.* (2016) and Zamani *et al.* (2016). Zhang (2016) uses spectral methods to develop goodness of fit tests for FTS's.

Section 2 introduces the requisite background and notation. The theory for the principal component analysis of periodically correlated FTS's is presented in Section 3, with proofs postponed to Section 6. Section 4 shows how the methodology developed in the infinite dimensional framework of function spaces is translated to an implementable setting of finite dimensional objects. Its usefulness is illustrated in Section 5 by an application to a particulate pollution data set and a simulation study.

2 Notation and Preliminaries

This section introduces notation and background used throughout the paper. A generic separable Hilbert space is denoted by \mathbb{H} , its inner product and norm, respectively, by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$. The subscript \mathbb{H} is sometimes suppressed when there is no ambiguity.

The Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2([0, 1])$ and its T -fold Cartesian product \mathcal{H}^T are extensively used throughout the paper. They are equipped with inner products

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \int_0^1 f(s) \bar{g}(s) ds, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{H}$$

and

$$\left\langle \left(f_1 \ \cdots \ f_T \right)', \left(g_1 \ \cdots \ g_T \right)' \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^T} = \sum_{j=1}^T \langle f_j, g_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad f_j, g_j \in \mathcal{H},$$

respectively. An operator Ψ from a Hilbert space \mathbb{H} to \mathbb{C}^p is a bounded linear operator if and only if there exist (unique) elements Ψ_1, \dots, Ψ_p in \mathbb{H} such that

$$(2.1) \quad \Psi(h) = \left(\langle h, \Psi_1 \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}, \dots, \langle h, \Psi_p \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} \right)', \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{H}.$$

An operator Υ from \mathbb{C}^p to \mathbb{H} is linear and bounded if and only if there exist elements $\Upsilon_1, \dots, \Upsilon_p$ in \mathbb{H} such that

$$\Upsilon(y) = \Upsilon \left((y_1, \dots, y_p)' \right) = \sum_{m=1}^p y_m \Upsilon_m, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{C}^p.$$

For any two elements f and g in \mathbb{H} , $f \otimes g$ is a bounded linear operator defined by

$$f \otimes g : \mathbb{H} \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}, \quad f \otimes g : h \longmapsto \langle h, g \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} f.$$

We use $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}}$ to denote the operator norm, and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{N}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{S}}$ to denote, respectively, the nuclear and Hilbert-Schmidt norms, e.g. Horváth and Kokoszka (2012), Section 13.5.

In the following $L^2(\mathbb{H}, (-\pi, \pi])$ denotes the space of square integrable \mathbb{H} -valued functions on $(-\pi, \pi]$. Similarly, for a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ in place of $(-\pi, \pi]$, we use the notation $L^2(\mathbb{H}, \Omega)$. For two random elements $X, Y \in L^2(\mathbb{H}, \Omega)$, the covariance operator, $\text{Cov}(X, Y)$, is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(X, Y) &= E[(X - EX) \otimes (Y - EY)] : \mathbb{H} \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}, \\ \text{Cov}(X, Y) &: h \longmapsto E[\langle h, (Y - EY) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} (X - EX)]. \end{aligned}$$

DEFINITION 2.1 Let $X = \{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be an \mathbb{H} -valued time series with finite second moment, $E\|X_t\|^2 < \infty$. Then, X is said to be periodically correlated if there exists a positive integer T such that

$$\begin{aligned} EX_t &= EX_{t+T}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \text{Cov}(X_t, X_s) &= \text{Cov}(X_{t+T}, X_{s+T}), \quad \forall t, s \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

The smallest such T will be called the period of the process, and X is then said to be T -periodically correlated, or T -PC, for short. When $T = 1$, the process is (weakly) stationary.

For a T -PC process X , covariance operators at lag h are defined as

$$C_{h,(j,j')}^X = \text{Cov}(X_{Th+j}, X_{j'}), \quad h \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } j, j' = 0, 1, \dots, T-1.$$

It is easy to verify that the condition

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(j,j')}^X\|_{\mathcal{S}} < \infty, \quad j, j' = 0, 1, \dots, T-1,$$

implies that for each θ the series $\left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h=-n}^n C_{h,(j,j')}^X e^{-ih\theta} : n \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \right\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the Hilbert space of Hilbert-Schmidt operators on \mathbb{H} . Then, spectral density operators are well defined by

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(j,j')}^X = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} C_{h,(j,j')}^X e^{-ih\theta}, \quad j, j' = 0, \dots, T-1.$$

REMARK 2.1 The periodic behavior of covariance operator of X implies that the set $\{E \|X_t\|^2, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is finite. It consists of at most T elements because

$$E \|X_t\|^2 = \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(X_t, X_t)) = \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(X_{t+T}, X_{t+T})).$$

DEFINITION 2.2 A sequence $\{\Psi_l, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of operators from a Hilbert space \mathbb{H}_1 to a Hilbert space \mathbb{H}_2 satisfying

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Psi_l\|_{\mathcal{L}} < \infty,$$

is called a filter. A T -periodic filter $\{\{\Psi_l^t, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a sequence of filters which is T -periodic with respect to t i.e. $\Psi_l^t = \Psi_l^{t+T}$, for each t and l . Consequently,

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Psi_l^t\|_{\mathcal{L}} < \infty.$$

Related to the filter $\{\Psi_l, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $\Psi(B)$ is an operator from $(\mathbb{H}_1)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ to $(\mathbb{H}_2)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of the following form

$$\Psi(B) = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_l B^l,$$

where B is the backward shift operator. In the other words, if $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a time series with values in \mathbb{H}_1 , then $\Psi(B)$ transforms it to an \mathbb{H}_2 -valued time series defined by

$$(\Psi(B)(X))_t = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_l(X_{t-l}).$$

For a $p \times p$ matrix \mathbf{A} , $a_{q,r}$ denotes the entry in the q -th row and r -th column. To indicate that $t = kT + d$ for some integer k , we write $t \stackrel{T}{\equiv} d$.

3 Principal component analysis of periodically correlated functional time series

Before proceeding with the definitions and statements of properties of the principal component analysis for PC-FTS's, we provide a brief introduction, focusing on the ideas and omitting mathematical assumptions. Suppose $\{X_t\}$ is a weakly dependent, stationary mean zero time series of functions in \mathcal{H} . It admits the Karhunen–Loève expansion

$$(3.1) \quad X_t(u) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \xi_{tm} v_m(u), \quad E \xi_{tm}^2 = \lambda_m,$$

where the v_m are the functional principal components (called *static* FPC's in Hörmann *et al.* (2015)). The orthonormal functions v_m are uniquely defined up to a sign, and the random variables ξ_{tm} are called their scores. Even for stationary (rather than periodically correlated) functional time series, the *dynamic* FPC's are not defined as one function for every “frequency” level m . The analog of (3.1) is

$$(3.2) \quad X_t(u) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{m,t+l} \phi_{ml}(u).$$

A single function v_m is thus replaced by an infinite sequence of functions $\{\phi_{ml}, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. However, one can still define the scores as single numbers for every frequency level m , using the formula $Y_{mt} = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{t-l}, \phi_{ml} \rangle$. The analog of λ_m is

$$\nu_m := E \left\| \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{m,t+l} \phi_{ml} \right\|^2,$$

and we have the decomposition of variance $E \|X_t\|^2 = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \nu_m$. In this section, we will see how these results extend to the setting of periodically correlated functional time series, which is necessarily more complex as it involves periodic sequences of functions. The scores, and reconstructions obtained from them, will have certain periodic properties. *All results stated in this section are proven in Section 6.*

In order to define the dynamic functional principal components in our setting, we first establish conditions for the existence of a filtered (output) process of a T -PC functional times series. The periodic structure of the covariance operators of the T -PC input process $X = \{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ suggests applying a T -periodic functional filter $\{\{\Psi_l^t, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ to obtain a filtered process $\mathbf{Y} = \{\mathbf{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with values in \mathbb{C}^p .

THEOREM 3.1 *Let $X = \{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be an \mathcal{H} -valued T -PC process and $\{\{\Psi_l^t, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ a T -periodic filter from \mathcal{H} to \mathbb{C}^p with the elements $\Psi_{l,m}^t, m = 1, \dots, p$ in \mathcal{H} , as described in (2.1). In particular, we assume that (2.5) holds. Then, for each t , $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_l^t(X_{(t-l)})$ converges in mean square to a limit \mathbf{Y}_t .*

If, in addition,

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Psi_l^t\|_S < \infty,$$

then $\mathbf{Y} = \{\mathbf{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a T -PC process with the following $p \times p$ spectral density matrices $\mathcal{F}_{\theta,(d,f)}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ for $d, f = 0, \dots, T-1$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\theta,(d,f)}^{\mathbf{Y}} = \left[\left\langle \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \cdots & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,T-1)}^X \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(T-1,0)}^X & \cdots & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(T-1,T-1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,d,r}^d \\ \vdots \\ \Psi_{\theta,d-T+1,r}^d \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,f,q}^f \\ \vdots \\ \Psi_{\theta,f-T+1,q}^f \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2} \right]_{q,r=1,\dots,p}$$

where $\Psi_{\theta,d,q}^d = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{Tl+d,q}^d e^{il\theta}, \dots, \Psi_{\theta,d-T+1,q}^d = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{Tl+d-T+1,q}^d e^{il\theta}, f, d = 0, \dots, T-1$.

To illustrate the spectral density structure of the output process, we consider $T = 2$, in which case,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \left[\left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,r}^0 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,q}^0 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2} \right]_{q,r=1,\dots,p}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \left[\left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,1,r}^1 \\ \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^1 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,q}^0 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2} \right]_{q,r=1,\dots,p}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \left[\left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,r}^0 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,1,q}^1 \\ \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^1 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2} \right]_{q,r=1,\dots,p}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \left[\left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,1,r}^1 \\ \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^1 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,1,q}^1 \\ \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^1 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2} \right]_{q,r=1,\dots,p}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Psi_{\theta,0,q}^0 := \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2l,q}^0 e^{il\theta}$, $\Psi_{\theta,-1,q}^0 := \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2l-1,q}^0 e^{il\theta}$, $\Psi_{\theta,0,q}^1 := \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2l,q}^1 e^{il\theta}$, and $\Psi_{\theta,1,q}^1 := \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2l+1,q}^1 e^{il\theta}$.

We emphasize that (2.5) is a sufficient condition for the mean-square convergence of the series defining the filtered process \mathbf{Y} , and (3.3) guarantees the existence of spectral density operator of the filtered process. Hörmann *et al.* (2015), page 327, discuss this issue in the case of stationary input and output processes. *In the remainder of the paper, we assume (3.3) for each periodic functional filter.*

The operator matrix $(\mathcal{F}_{\theta,(d,f)}^X)_{0 \leq d, f \leq T-1}$ in Theorem 3.1 is a non-negative, self-adjoint compact operator from \mathcal{H}^T to \mathcal{H}^T , and so it admits the following spectral decomposition

$$(3.4) \quad (\mathcal{F}_{\theta,(d,f)}^X)_{0 \leq d, f \leq T-1} = \sum_{m \geq 1} \lambda_{\theta,m} \varphi_{\theta,m} \otimes \varphi_{\theta,m},$$

where $\lambda_{\theta,1} \geq \lambda_{\theta,2} \geq \dots \geq 0$, and $\{\varphi_{\theta,m}\}_{m \geq 1}$ forms a complete orthonormal basis for \mathcal{H}^T . By choosing $(\Psi_{\theta,d,q}^d \cdots \Psi_{\theta,d-T+1,q}^d)'$ as the eigenfunction $\varphi_{\theta,dp+q}$, the spectral density matrices of the filtered process $\mathbf{Y} = \{\mathbf{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ turn to diagonal matrices and an optimality property will be obtained. We are now ready to define the DFPC filter and scores of the periodically correlated process X .

DEFINITION 3.1 Let $X = \{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be an \mathcal{H} -valued mean zero T -PC random process satisfying condition (2.2) and $\{\Phi_{l,m}^d, d = 0, \dots, T-1, m = 1, \dots, p, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be elements of \mathcal{H} defined by

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \varphi_{\theta,dp+m} e^{-i\theta} d\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{lT+d,m}^d \\ \vdots \\ \Phi_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d \end{pmatrix}, \quad m = 1, \dots, p, \quad d = 0, \dots, T-1$$

for each l in \mathbb{Z} , or equivalently by

$$(3.6) \quad \varphi_{\theta,dp+m} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{\theta,d,m}^d \\ \vdots \\ \Phi_{\theta,d-T+1,m}^d \end{pmatrix}, \quad m = 1, \dots, p, \quad d = 0, \dots, T-1,$$

for each θ in $(-\pi, \pi]$. Then,

$$\{\Phi_{l,m}^d, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \quad d = 0, \dots, T-1,$$

is said to be the (d, m) -th dynamic functional principal component (DFPC) filter of the process X . Furthermore,

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} Y_{t,m} &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{(t-l)}, \Phi_{l,m}^d \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{(t-lT-d)}, \Phi_{lT+d,m}^d \rangle + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{(t-lT-d+1)}, \Phi_{lT+d-1,m}^d \rangle \\ &\quad + \cdots + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{(t-lT-d+T-1)}, \Phi_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d \rangle, \quad m = 1, \dots, p, \quad t \stackrel{T}{\equiv} d \end{aligned}$$

will be called the (t, m) -th DFPC score of X .

For illustration, in case of $T = 2$, we have for $m = 1, \dots, p$,

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \varphi_{\theta,m} e^{-i\theta} d\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \\ \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \varphi_{\theta,p+m} e^{-i\theta} d\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{2l+1,m}^1 \\ \Phi_{2l,m}^1 \end{pmatrix},$$

for each l in \mathbb{Z} , or equivalently,

$$\varphi_{\theta,m} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{\theta,0,m}^0 \\ \Phi_{\theta,-1,m}^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{\theta,p+m} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{\theta,1,m}^1 \\ \Phi_{\theta,0,m}^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta \in (-\pi, \pi].$$

The filters $\{\Phi_{l,m}^d, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are defined for $d = 0, 1$.

The following proposition lists some useful properties of the p -dimensional output process $\{\mathbf{Y}_t = (Y_{t,1}, \dots, Y_{t,p})', t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ defined by (3.7).

PROPOSITION 3.1 *Let $X = \{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be an \mathcal{H} -valued mean zero T -PC random process and assume that (2.2) holds. Then,*

- (a) *the eigenfunctions $\varphi_m(\theta)$ are Hermitian i.e. $\varphi_{-\theta, m} = \overline{\varphi_{\theta, m}}$ and the DFPC scores $Y_{t, m}$ are real-valued provided that X is real-valued;*
- (b) *for each (t, m) , the series (3.7) is mean-square convergent, has mean zero:*

$$(3.9) \quad EY_{t, m} = 0,$$

and satisfies for $t \equiv d$,

$$(3.10) \quad E \|Y_{t, m}\|^2 = \sum_{j_1, j_2=0}^{T-1} \sum_{k, l \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\langle C_{k-l, (j_1, j_2)}^X (\Phi_{kT+d-j_2, m}^d), \Phi_{lT+d-j_1, m}^d \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}};$$

- (c) *for any t and s , the DFPC scores $Y_{t, m}$ and $Y_{s, m'}$ are uncorrelated if $s - t$ is not a multiple of T or $m \neq m'$. In other words $C_{h, (j_1, j_2)}^{\mathbf{Y}} = 0$ for $j_1 \neq j_2$ and $C_{h, (j, j)}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ are diagonal matrices for all h ;*
- (d) *the long-run covariance matrix of the filtered process $\{\mathbf{Y}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ satisfies the following limiting equality*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{Y}_n) = \frac{2\pi}{T} \sum_{d=0}^{T-1} \text{diag}(\lambda_{0, dp+1}, \dots, \lambda_{0, dp+p}).$$

For illustration, if $T = 2$, then

$$(3.11) \quad E \|Y_{t, m}\|^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l, (0, 0)}^X (\Phi_{2k, m}^0), \Phi_{2l, m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l, (0, 1)}^X (\Phi_{2k-1, m}^0), \Phi_{2l, m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l, (1, 0)}^X (\Phi_{2k, m}^0), \Phi_{2l-1, m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l, (1, 1)}^X (\Phi_{2k-1, m}^0), \Phi_{2l-1, m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad t \equiv 0$$

and

$$(3.12) \quad E \|Y_{t, m}\|^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l, (1, 1)}^X (\Phi_{2k, m}^1), \Phi_{2l, m}^1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l, (1, 0)}^X (\Phi_{2k+1, m}^1), \Phi_{2l, m}^1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l, (0, 1)}^X (\Phi_{2k, m}^1), \Phi_{2l+1, m}^1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l, (0, 0)}^X (\Phi_{2k+1, m}^1), \Phi_{2l+1, m}^1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad t \equiv 1.$$

The long-run covariance matrix is given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{Y}_n) = \frac{2\pi}{2} [\text{diag}(\lambda_{0,1}, \dots, \lambda_{0,p}) + \text{diag}(\lambda_{0,p+1}, \dots, \lambda_{0,2p})].$$

The following theorem provides a formula for reconstructing the original \mathcal{H} -valued process X from its DFPC scores $\{Y_{t,m}, t \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 1\}$.

THEOREM 3.2 (Inversion Formula) *Let $X = \{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be an \mathcal{H} -valued mean zero T -PC random process, and $\{Y_{t,m}, t \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 1\}$ be its DFPC scores. For each time t and positive integer m define $X_{t,m}$ to be*

$$\begin{aligned} X_{t,m} &: = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{t+lT-d,m} \Phi_{lT-d,m}^0 + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{t+lT-d+1,m} \Phi_{lT-d+1,m}^1 \\ &\quad + \cdots + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{t+lT-d+T-1,m} \Phi_{lT-d+T-1,m}^{T-1}, \quad t \equiv d \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$X_t = \sum_{m \geq 1} X_{t,m}, \quad t \equiv d,$$

where the convergence holds in mean square provided that

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{d=0}^{T-1} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{l,m}^d\|_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty.$$

If $T = 2$, then

$$X_{t,m} := \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{t+2l,m} \Phi_{2l,m}^0 + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{t+2l+1,m} \Phi_{2l+1,m}^1, \quad t \equiv 0$$

$$X_{t,m} := \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{t+2l-1,m} \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} Y_{t+2l,m} \Phi_{2l,m}^1, \quad t \equiv 1.$$

The following theorem establishes an optimality property of the above DFPC filter based on a mean square distance criterion.

THEOREM 3.3 (Optimality) *Let $X = \{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be an \mathcal{H} -valued mean zero T -PC random process, and $\{X_{t,m}, t \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 1\}$ be as in Theorem 3.2.*

For arbitrary \mathcal{H} -valued sequences

$$\{\Psi_{l,m}^t, t = 0, \dots, T-1, m \geq 1, l \in \mathbb{Z}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\Upsilon_{l,m}^t, t = 0, \dots, T-1, m \geq 1, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

with $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Psi_{l,m}^t\| < \infty$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Upsilon_{l,m}^t\| < \infty$, for each m , consider

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}_{t,m} &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{(t-l)}, \Psi_{l,m}^d \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{(t-lT-d)}, \Psi_{lT+d,m}^d \rangle + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{(t-lT-d+1)}, \Psi_{lT+d-1,m}^d \rangle \\ &\quad + \cdots + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{(t-lT-d+T-1)}, \Psi_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d \rangle, \quad t \equiv d \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{t,m} &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{Y}_{t+lT-d,m} \Upsilon_{lT-d,m}^0 + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{Y}_{t+lT-d+1,m} \Upsilon_{lT-d+1,m}^1 \\ &\quad + \cdots + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{Y}_{t+lT-d+T-1,m} \Upsilon_{lT-d+T-1,m}^{T-1}, \quad t \equiv d \end{aligned}$$

Then, the following inequality holds for each $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $p \geq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left\| X_{Tt} - \sum_{m=1}^p X_{Tt,m} \right\|^2 + \cdots + E \left\| X_{Tt+T-1} - \sum_{m=1}^p X_{Tt+T-1,m} \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{m > p} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \lambda_m(\theta) d\theta \\ &\leq E \left\| X_{Tt} - \sum_{m=1}^p \tilde{X}_{Tt,m} \right\|^2 + \cdots + E \left\| X_{Tt+T-1} - \sum_{m=1}^p \tilde{X}_{Tt+T-1,m} \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

In practice, the scores $Y_{t,m}$ are estimated by truncated sums of the form

$$\begin{aligned} (3.14) \quad \hat{Y}_{t,m} &= \sum_{l=-LT+d-T+1}^{LT+d} \langle X_{t-l}, \hat{\Phi}_{l,m}^d \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l=-L}^L \langle X_{t-lT-d}, \hat{\Phi}_{lT+d,m}^d \rangle + \cdots \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=-L}^L \langle X_{t-lT-d+T-1}, \hat{\Phi}_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d \rangle, \quad t \equiv d, \end{aligned}$$

in which $\hat{\Phi}_{l,m}^d$ s are obtained from an estimator $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\theta,(q,r)}^X$. In an asymptotic setting, the truncation level L is treated as an increasing function of n (the length of the time series). (Recommendations for the selection of L in finite samples are discussed in Sections 4 and 5.)

We conclude this section by showing that under mild assumptions, $E \left| \widehat{Y}_{t,m} - Y_{t,m} \right| \rightarrow 0$, Theorem 3.4. We first state the conditions under which the above result holds. Condition 3.1 is intuitive, the spectral density operator must be consistently estimated. The other two conditions are more technical, but also intuitively clear.

CONDITION 3.1 *The estimator $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\theta,(q,r)}^X$ satisfies*

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} E \left\| \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(q,r)}^X - \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\theta,(q,r)}^X \right\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty; \quad q, r = 0, \dots, T-1.$$

CONDITION 3.2 *Let $\lambda_{\theta,m}$ be as in (3.4) and define $\alpha_{\theta,1} := \lambda_{\theta,1} - \lambda_{\theta,2}$ and $\alpha_{\theta,m} := \min \{ \lambda_{\theta,m-1} - \lambda_{\theta,m}, \lambda_{\theta,m} - \lambda_{\theta,m+1} \}$, $m > 1$. Assume that for each m , set $\{ \alpha_{\theta,m} : \theta \in (-\pi, \pi] \}$ has at most finitely many zeros.*

Condition 3.2 assures that for almost all $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$ the m -th eigenspace is one-dimensional.

CONDITION 3.3 *Let $\varphi_{\theta,m}$ be as defined in (3.4) and ω be a given element in \mathcal{H}^T . Set the orientation of $\varphi_{\theta,m}$ such that $\langle \varphi_{\theta,m}, \omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^T} \in (0, \infty)$ whenever $\langle \varphi_{\theta,m}, \omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^T} \neq 0$. Assume $\mathcal{L}eb \{ \theta : \langle \varphi_{\theta,m}, \omega \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^T} = 0 \} = 0$, where $\mathcal{L}eb$ stands for the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} restricted to the interval $(-\pi, \pi]$.*

Under Condition 3.3 we can set a specific orientation of eigenfunctions $\varphi_{\theta,m}$ and avoid considering different versions of DFPC's.

THEOREM 3.4 *If Conditions 3.1-3.3 hold, then there is an increasing function $L = L(n)$ such that $E \left| \widehat{Y}_{t,m} - Y_{t,m} \right| \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

4 Numerical implementation

The theory presented in Section 3 is developed in the framework of infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces in which the various functional objects live. Practically usable methodology requires a number of dimension reduction steps to create approximating finite dimensional objects which can be manipulated by computers. This section describes the main steps of such a reduction. We developed an R package, `pcdpca`, which allows to perform all procedures described in this paper. In particular, it is used to perform the analysis and simulations in Section 5.

We use linearly independent basis functions $\{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_K\}$ to convert the data observed at discrete time points to functional objects of the form $x(u) = \sum_{j=1}^K c_j B_j(u)$. This is just the usual basis expansion step, see e.g. Chapter 3 of Ramsay *et al.* (2009) or Chapter 1 of Kokoszka and Reimherr (2017). We thus work in a finite dimensional space $\mathcal{H}_K = \text{sp} \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_K\}$. To each bounded linear operator $A : \mathcal{H}_K \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_K$ there corresponds a complex-valued $K \times K$ matrix \mathfrak{A} defined by the relation $A(x) = \mathbf{B}'\mathfrak{A}\mathbf{c}$,

where $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_K)'$ and $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K)'$. Let \mathbf{M}_B be the complex-valued $K \times K$ matrix $(\langle B_q, B_r \rangle)_{q,r=0,\dots,K}$, $X_t = \mathbf{B}'\mathbf{c}_t$, and define

$$\mathbf{B}'_T := \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} B_1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{array} \right), \dots, \left(\begin{array}{c} B_K \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{array} \right), \dots, \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ B_1 \end{array} \right), \dots, \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ B_K \end{array} \right) \right) = (\mathbf{b}'_1, \mathbf{b}'_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}'_T).$$

Next, define the matrix

$$(4.1) \quad \mathfrak{F}_\theta^X = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^c & \cdots & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,T-1)}^c \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(T-1,0)}^c & \cdots & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(T-1,T-1)}^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}'_B & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & \mathbf{M}'_B \end{pmatrix}$$

as the matrix corresponding to the operator \mathcal{F}_θ^X , restricted to the subspace \mathcal{H}_K^T . Recall the definition of the spectral density operators $\mathcal{F}_{\theta,(q,r)}^c$ corresponding to T-PC sequence $\mathbf{c} = \{\mathbf{c}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ from (2.3).

If $\lambda_{\theta,m}$ and $\varphi_{\theta,m} := (\varphi'_{\theta,m,1}, \dots, \varphi'_{\theta,m,T})'$ are the m -th eigenvalue and eigenfunction of $TK \times TK$ complex-valued matrix \mathfrak{F}_θ^X , then $\lambda_{\theta,m}$ and

$$\mathbf{B}'_T \varphi_{\theta,m} = (\mathbf{b}'_1, \mathbf{b}'_2, \dots, \mathbf{b}'_T) (\varphi'_{\theta,m,1}, \dots, \varphi'_{\theta,m,T})' = (\mathbf{B}'\varphi_{\theta,m,1}, \dots, \mathbf{B}'\varphi_{\theta,m,T})'$$

are the m -th eigenvalue and eigenfunction of the operator \mathcal{F}_θ^X . This motivates us to use the ordinary multivariate techniques to estimate $C_{h,(q,r)}^c$ and consequently $\mathcal{F}_{\theta,(q,r)}^c$, for $q, r = 0, \dots, T-1$, and $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$, by

$$\widehat{C}_{h,(q,r)}^c = \frac{T}{n} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{c}_{q+Tj} \mathbf{c}'_{r+Tj-Th} I\{1 \leq q+Tj \leq n\} I\{1 \leq r+Tj-Th \leq n\}, \quad h \geq 0,$$

$$\left(\widehat{C}_{-h,(q,r)}^c \right)' = \widehat{C}_{h,(q,r)}^c, \quad h < 0,$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\theta,(q,r)}^c = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{|h| \leq q(n)} w\left(\frac{h}{q(n)}\right) \widehat{C}_{h,(q,r)}^c e^{-ih\theta},$$

where w is a suitable weight function, $q(n) \rightarrow \infty$, and $\frac{q(n)}{n} \rightarrow 0$. Replace (4.2) by (4.1) to obtain a consistent estimator $\widehat{\mathfrak{F}}_\theta^X$ with eigenvalues $\widehat{\lambda}_{\theta,m}$ and eigenvectors $\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m} := (\widehat{\varphi}'_{\theta,m,1}, \dots, \widehat{\varphi}'_{\theta,m,T})'$, $m \geq 1$. Use

$$\mathbf{B}'_T \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m} = (\mathbf{b}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}'_T) \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m,1} \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m,T} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}'\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m,1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}'\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m,T} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m,1} \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m,T} \end{pmatrix} = \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}$$

to get estimators $\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}$, and set

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}'\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,dp+m,1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}'\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,dp+m,T} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\Phi}_{\theta,d,m}^d \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{\Phi}_{\theta,d-T+1,m}^d \end{pmatrix},$$

or equivalently

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}'\widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d,m}^d \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}'\widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d \end{pmatrix} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}'\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,dp+m,1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}'\widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,dp+m,T} \end{pmatrix} e^{-i\theta} d\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d,m}^d \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d \end{pmatrix},$$

for $d = 0, \dots, T-1$, $m = 1, \dots, p$. Note that one may use numerical integration to find $\widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^d$. Therefore, the PC-DFPC scores can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Y}_{t,m} &= \sum_{l=-LT+d-T+1}^{LT+d} \langle X_{t-l}, \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^d \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l=-L}^L \langle X_{t-lT-d}, \widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d,m}^d \rangle + \dots + \sum_{l=-L}^L \langle X_{t-lT-d+T-1}, \widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l=-L}^L \mathbf{c}'_{(t-lT-d)} \mathbf{M}_B \widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d,m}^d + \dots + \sum_{l=-L}^L \mathbf{c}'_{(t-lT-d+T-1)} \mathbf{M}_B \widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d, \quad t \equiv d, \end{aligned}$$

where L satisfies

$$\sum_{l=-L}^L \left(\left\| \widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d,m}^d \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \dots + \left\| \widehat{\Phi}_{lT+d-T+1,m}^d \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

for some d and small $\varepsilon > 0$. Consequently, X_t can be approximated by

$$\widehat{X}_t = \sum_{m=1}^p \sum_{l=-L}^L \widehat{Y}_{t+lT-d,m} \widehat{\Phi}_{lT-d,m}^0 + \dots + \sum_{m=1}^p \sum_{l=-L}^L \widehat{Y}_{t+lT-d+T-1,m} \widehat{\Phi}_{lT-d+T-1,m}^{T-1}, \quad t \equiv d.$$

REMARK 4.1 Usually, the mean μ of the process X is not known. In this case we first use smoothed functions $X_t = \mathbf{B}'\mathbf{c}_t$ to obtain estimators $\widehat{\mu}_0, \dots, \widehat{\mu}_{T-1}$ or T -periodic mean function estimator $\{\widehat{\mu}_t : \widehat{\mu}_{T+k+d} = \widehat{\mu}_d; k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, then apply the above method to the centered functional observations $X_t^* = X_t - \widehat{\mu}_t$.

For illustration, set $T = 2$ and define

$$\mathbf{B}'_T = \left(\begin{pmatrix} B_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} B_K \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ B_1 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ B_K \end{pmatrix} \right) = (\mathbf{b}'_1, \mathbf{b}'_2)$$

as a vector of linearly independent elements in \mathcal{H}^2 . The matrix

$$(4.4) \quad \mathfrak{F}_\theta^X = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^c & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^c \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^c & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}'_B & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{M}'_B \end{pmatrix}$$

corresponds to the operator \mathcal{F}_θ^X restricted to the subspace \mathcal{H}_K^2 . For $q, r = 0, 1$,

$$\widehat{C}_{h,(q,r)}^c = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{c}_{q+2j} \mathbf{c}'_{r+2j-2h} I \{1 \leq q+2j \leq n\} I \{1 \leq r+2j-2h \leq n\}, \quad h \geq 0,$$

Estimators of the PC-DFPC filter coefficient $\Phi_{l,m}^d$ and the PC-DFPC scores $Y_{t,m}$ are

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}' \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 \\ \mathbf{B}' \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0 \end{pmatrix} : = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}' \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m,1} \\ \mathbf{B}' \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m,2} \end{pmatrix} e^{-il\theta} d\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 \\ \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}' \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m+p}^1 \\ \mathbf{B}' \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m+p}^1 \end{pmatrix} : = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}' \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m+p,1} \\ \mathbf{B}' \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m+p,2} \end{pmatrix} e^{-il\theta} d\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\Phi}_{2l+1,m}^1 \\ \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad m = 1, \dots, p.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Y}_{t,m} &= \sum_{l=-2L-1}^{2L} \langle X_{(t-l)}, \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^0 \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l=-L}^L \mathbf{c}'_{(t-2l)} \mathbf{M}_B \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 + \sum_{l=-L}^L \mathbf{c}'_{(t-2l+1)} \mathbf{M}_B \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0, \quad t \stackrel{2}{\equiv} 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Y}_{t,m} &= \sum_{l=-2L}^{2L+1} \langle X_{(t-l)}, \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^1 \rangle \\ &= \sum_{l=-L}^L \mathbf{c}'_{(t-2l)} \mathbf{M}_B \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^1 + \sum_{l=-L}^L \mathbf{c}'_{(t-2l-1)} \mathbf{M}_B \widehat{\Phi}_{2l+1,m}^1, \quad t \stackrel{2}{\equiv} 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\widehat{X}_t = \sum_{m=1}^p \sum_{l=-L}^L \widehat{Y}_{t+2l,m} \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 + \sum_{m=1}^p \sum_{l=-L}^L \widehat{Y}_{t+2l+1,m} \widehat{\Phi}_{2l+1,m}^1, \quad t \stackrel{2}{\equiv} 0,$$

$$\widehat{X}_t = \sum_{m=1}^p \sum_{l=-L}^L \widehat{Y}_{t+2l,m} \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^1 + \sum_{m=1}^p \sum_{l=-L}^L \widehat{Y}_{t+2l-1,m} \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0, \quad t \stackrel{2}{\equiv} 1.$$

5 Application to particulate pollution data and a simulation study

To illustrate the advantages of PC-DFPCA relative the (stationary) DFPCA which may arise in certain settings, we further explore the dataset analyzed in Hörmann *et al.* (2015). The dataset contains intraday measurements of pollution in Graz, Austria between October 1, 2010 and March 31, 2011. Observations were sampled every 30 minutes and measure concentration of particle matter of diameter of less than $10\mu m$ in the ambient air. In order to facilitate the comparison with the results reported in Hörmann *et al.* (2015), we employ exactly the same preprocessing procedure, including square-root transformation, removal of the mean weakly pattern and outliers. Note that the removal of the mean weakly pattern does not affect periodic covariances between weekdays and therefore they can be exploited using the PC-DFPCA procedure applied with the period $T = 7$. The preprocessed dataset contains 175 daily curves, each converted to a functional object with 15 Fourier basis functions, yielding a functional time series $\{X_t : 1 \leq t \leq 175\}$.

For FPCA and DFPCA we use the same procedure as Hörmann *et al.* (2015) using the implementation published by those researchers as the R package `freqdom`. To implement the PC-DFPCA, some modifications are needed. Regarding the metaparameters q and L , Hörmann *et al.* (2015) advise choosing $q \sim \sqrt{n}$ and L such that $\sum_{-L \leq i \leq L} \|\Phi_{m,t}^d\|^2 \sim 1$. By design, our estimators of covariances use only around n/T of all observations and therefore we scale q further by \sqrt{T} , obtaining $q = 4$. To avoid overfitting we set $L = 3$ (compared to 10 in Hörmann *et al.* (2015)), as it now relates to weeks not days and we do not expect dependence beyond 3 weeks.

As a measure of fit, we use the Normalized Mean Squared Error (NMSE) defined as

$$\text{NMSE} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n \|X_t - \hat{X}_t\|^2}{\sum_{t=1}^n \|X_t\|^2},$$

where the \hat{X}_t are the observations obtained from the inverse transform. We refer to the value $\text{NMSE} \cdot 100\%$ as the *percentage of variance explained*.

For the sake of comparison and discussion, we focus only on the first principal component, which already explains 73% of variability in the static FPCA, 80% of variability in the DFPCA and 88% of variability in the PC-DFPCA procedure. Curves corresponding to the components obtained through each of these methods are presented in Figure 1. As the percentages above suggest, there is a clear progression in the quality of the approximation using just one component. This is an important finding because the purpose of the principal component analysis of any type is to reduce the dimension of the data using the smallest possible number of projections without sacrificing the quality of approximation.

Hörmann *et al.* (2015) observed that, for this particular dataset, the sequences of scores of the DFPC's and the static FPC's were almost identical. This is no longer the case if the PC-DFPC's are used. Figure 2 compares the DFPC and the PC-DFPC scores




Figure 1: Ten successive intraday observations of PM10 data (top-left), the corresponding functional PCA curves reconstructed from the first principal component (top-right), dynamic functional principal component curves (bottom-left) and periodically-correlated dynamic principal components (bottom-right). Colors and types of curves match the same observations among plots.

and shows that the resulting time series are quite different. The PC-DFPCA takes into account the periodic correlation structure which neither the static nor the (stationary) DFPCA do.




Figure 2: The first dynamic principal component scores (left), the first periodically correlated dynamic principal component scores (middle) and differences between the two series (right).

The estimated PC-DFPCA filters are very high dimensional as can be seen in Figure 3. In particular, with $L = 3$, $T = 7$ and $p = 15$ we estimated $(2L + 1)T^2p^2 = 735$ real numbers, which may raise concerns about overfitting. This however does not translate into problems with the finite sample performance, as the following simulation study shows.

To further analyze the properties of the PC-DFPCA filter, we design two simulation studies, with two distinct periodically correlated functional time series. In the first study we set $p = 7$, $T = 3$, $n = 300$ and generate variables $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \text{diag}(\exp(-2 \cdot \frac{1}{p}), \exp(-2 \cdot \frac{2}{p}), \dots, \exp(-2 \cdot \frac{p}{p})))$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 100\}$. The exponential decay emulates the decay of typical functional data observations in Fourier basis representation, where high frequencies tend to 0. Next, we define the multivariate time series as follows

$$\mathbf{c}_{T_i+1} = \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{c}_{T_i+2} = \mathbf{b}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{c}_{T_i+3} = 2\mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{b}_i \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 100\}.$$

We divide the set of $\{\mathbf{c}_t : t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 300\}\}$ into a training set (first 150 observations) and test set (last 150 observations). We train the three methods: FPCA, DFPCA and PC-DFPCA on the training set and compare the normalized mean squared errors on the test set. We choose parameters: $L = 2$, $q = 3$ and Bartlett weights. We repeat the simulation 100 times and record average NMSE from all runs. As illustrated in Figure 4, PC-DFPCA outperforms the two other methods with mean 0.59 (sd = 0.05) compared to DFPCA 0.76 (sd = 0.04) and FPCA 0.74 (sd = 0.04).

In the second simulation scenario, we sampled a functional periodically correlated autoregressive process. We set $p = 7$, $T = 2$ and $n = 1000$ and generate iid innovations

$$\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$$




Figure 3: Filters of the first principal component for $d = 0$, i.e. corresponding to Monday. For every $m = 1, 2, \dots, 7$ (as in the legend in parenthesis), the five curves of the same color correspond to $\Phi_{-2,m}^d, \Phi_{-1,m}^d, \dots, \Phi_{2,m}^d$

with

$$\Sigma = \text{diag}(\exp(-2 \cdot 1/p), \exp(-2 \cdot 2/p), \dots, \exp(-2 \cdot p/p))$$

for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We sample 4 operators $P_{i,j} = [\delta_{k,l}]_{1 \leq k, l \leq p}$ and define $\Psi_{i,j} = 0.9 \cdot P_{i,j} / \|P_{i,j}\|$ for $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, where $\delta_{k,l} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \exp(-2 \cdot \frac{l}{p}))$. We define the process \mathbf{c}_t as

$$\mathbf{c}_t = [0, 0, \dots, 0]' \text{ for } t \leq 0$$

and for $d \in \{0, 1\}$ and any $1 \leq t \leq n$ we set

$$\mathbf{c}_t = \Psi_{d,0} \mathbf{c}_{t-1} + \Psi_{d,1} \mathbf{c}_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t \text{ for } t \equiv d.$$

As in the first simulation, we repeat the experiment 100 times, record average NMSE and

present results in Figure 4. Again PC-DFPCA outperforms the two other methods with mean 0.51 (sd = 0.07) compared to DFPCA 0.55 (sd = 0.07) and FPCA 0.67 (sd = 0.1).




Figure 4: Results of two simulation studies. We repeat every simulation 100 times and report distribution of NMSE from these repetitions. PC-DFPCA outperforms the two other methods in both setups.

6 Proofs of the results of Section 3

To explain the essence and technique of the proofs, we consider the special case of $T = 2$. The arguments for general T proceed analogously, merely with a more heavy and less explicit notation, which may obscure the essential arguments.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1: To establish the mean square convergence of the series $\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_l^t(X_{(t-l)})$, let $S_{n,t}$ be its partial sum, i.e. $S_{n,t} = \sum_{-n \leq l \leq n} \Psi_l^t(X_{(t-l)})$, for each positive integer n . Then for $m < n$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
 E \|S_{n,t} - S_{m,t}\|_{\mathbb{C}^p}^2 &= \sum_{m < |l|, |k| \leq n} E \langle \Psi_l^t(X_{(t-l)}), \Psi_k^t(X_{(t-k)}) \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^p} \\
 &\leq \sum_{m < |l|, |k| \leq n} E (\|\Psi_l^t(X_{(t-l)})\|_{\mathbb{C}^p} \|\Psi_k^t(X_{(t-k)})\|_{\mathbb{C}^p}) \\
 &\leq \sum_{m < |l|, |k| \leq n} \|\Psi_l^t\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Psi_k^t\|_{\mathcal{L}} E (\|X_{(t-l)}\| \|X_{(t-k)}\|) \\
 &\leq \sum_{m < |l|, |k| \leq n} \|\Psi_l^t\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Psi_k^t\|_{\mathcal{L}} \left(E \|X_{(t-l)}\|^2 E \|X_{(t-k)}\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 &\leq M \sum_{|l| > m} \sum_{|k| > m} \|\Psi_l^t\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Psi_k^t\|_{\mathcal{L}} \quad \text{for some } M \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\
 (6.1) \quad &\leq M \left(\sum_{|l| > m} \|\Psi_l^t\|_{\mathcal{L}} \right)^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Summability condition (2.5) implies that (6.1) tends to zero, as n and m tend to infinity. Therefore, $\{S_{n,t}, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ forms a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\mathbb{C}^p, \Omega)$, for each t , which implies the desired mean square convergence. According to the representation of the filtered process \mathbf{Y} at time t i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{Y}_t &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_l^0(X_{(t-l)}) \\
 &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2l}^0(X_{(t-2l)}) + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2l-1}^0(X_{(t-2l+1)}), \quad t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{Y}_t &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_l^1(X_{(t-l)}) \\
 &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2l}^1(X_{(t-2l)}) + \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2l+1}^1(X_{(t-2l-1)}), \quad t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1,
 \end{aligned}$$

for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}(\mathbf{Y}_{2h}, \mathbf{Y}_0) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|k| \leq n} \sum_{|l| \leq n} \text{Cov}(\Psi_k^0(X_{(2h-k)}), \Psi_l^0(X_{(0-l)})) \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k)}, X_{-2l}) (\Psi_{2l}^0)^* \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k)}, X_{-2l+1}) (\Psi_{2l-1}^0)^* \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k-1}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k+1)}, X_{-2l}) (\Psi_{2l}^0)^* \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k-1}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k+1)}, X_{-2l+1}) (\Psi_{2l-1}^0)^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Cov}(\mathbf{Y}_{2h}, \mathbf{Y}_0) e^{-ih\theta} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k)}, X_{-2l}) (\Psi_{2l}^0)^* e^{-ih\theta} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k)}, X_{-2l+1}) (\Psi_{2l-1}^0)^* e^{-ih\theta} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k-1}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k+1)}, X_{-2l}) (\Psi_{2l}^0)^* e^{-ih\theta} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k-1}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k+1)}, X_{-2l+1}) (\Psi_{2l-1}^0)^* e^{-ih\theta},
\end{aligned}$$

which leads

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k+2l)}, X_0) (\Psi_{2l}^0)^* e^{-i(h-k+l)\theta} e^{il\theta} e^{-ik\theta} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k+2l)}, X_1) (\Psi_{2l-1}^0)^* e^{-i(h-k+l)\theta} e^{il\theta} e^{-ik\theta} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k-1}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k+2l+1)}, X_0) (\Psi_{2l}^0)^* e^{-i(h-k+l)\theta} e^{il\theta} e^{-ik\theta} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k-1}^0 \text{Cov}(X_{(2h-2k+2l+1)}, X_1) (\Psi_{2l-1}^0)^* e^{-i(h-k+l)\theta} e^{il\theta} e^{-ik\theta},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k}^0 \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^X (\Psi_{2l}^0)^* e^{il\theta} e^{-ik\theta} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k}^0 \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^X (\Psi_{2l-1}^0)^* e^{il\theta} e^{-ik\theta} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k-1}^0 \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^X (\Psi_{2l}^0)^* e^{il\theta} e^{-ik\theta} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Psi_{2k-1}^0 \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,1)}^X (\Psi_{2l-1}^0)^* e^{il\theta} e^{-ik\theta} \\
&= : \Psi_{\theta,0}^0 \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^X (\Psi_{\theta,0}^0)^* \\
&\quad + \Psi_{\theta,0}^0 \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^X (\Psi_{\theta,-1}^0)^* \\
&\quad + \Psi_{\theta,-1}^0 \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^X (\Psi_{\theta,0}^0)^* \\
&\quad + \Psi_{\theta,-1}^0 \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,1)}^X (\Psi_{\theta,-1}^0)^* .
\end{aligned}$$

The operator $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^{\mathbf{Y}}$ from \mathbb{C}^p to \mathbb{C}^p has the following matrix form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\left\langle (\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^X)^* (\Psi_{\theta,0,r}^0), \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right)_{p \times p} \\
&+ \left(\left\langle (\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^X)^* (\Psi_{\theta,0,r}^0), \Psi_{\theta,-1,q}^0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right)_{p \times p} \\
&+ \left(\left\langle (\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^X)^* (\Psi_{\theta,-1,r}^0), \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right)_{p \times p} \\
&+ \left(\left\langle (\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,1)}^X)^* (\Psi_{\theta,-1,r}^0), \Psi_{\theta,-1,q}^0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right)_{p \times p} ,
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \left(\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^X \right)^* & \left(\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^X \right)^* \\ \left(\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^X \right)^* & \left(\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,1)}^X \right)^* \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,r}^0 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,q}^0 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2} \\
&= \left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,r}^0 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,q}^0 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2} .
\end{aligned}$$

Using similar arguments leads to the following representations for $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^{\mathbf{Y}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^{\mathbf{Y}}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,1)}^{\mathbf{Y}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,1,r}^1 \\ \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^1 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,q}^0 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2} \\
\mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^{\mathbf{Y}} &= \left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta, (1,1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^0 \\ \Psi_{\theta,-1,r}^0 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,1,q}^1 \\ \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^1 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^{\mathbf{Y}} = \left\langle \left(\begin{array}{cc} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,1,r}^1 \\ \Psi_{\theta,0,r}^1 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \Psi_{\theta,1,q}^1 \\ \Psi_{\theta,0,q}^1 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2}.$$

Note that the 2-periodic behavior of the covariance operators of the filtered process \mathbf{Y} is an implicit result of the above argument, which completes the proof of Theorem 3.1 for the special case $T = 2$. The general case is similar. \blacksquare

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1: To establish part (a), consider the eigenvalue decomposition (3.4). We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\theta,m} \varphi_{\theta,m} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{pmatrix} (\varphi_{\theta,m}) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{\theta,m,1} \\ \varphi_{\theta,m,2} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X (\varphi_{\theta,m,1}) + \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X (\varphi_{\theta,m,2}) \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X (\varphi_{\theta,m,1}) + \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X (\varphi_{\theta,m,2}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \begin{pmatrix} E [\langle \varphi_{\theta,m,1}, X_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle \varphi_{\theta,m,2}, X_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] X_{2h} \\ E [\langle \varphi_{\theta,m,1}, X_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle \varphi_{\theta,m,2}, X_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] X_{2h+1} \end{pmatrix} e^{-ih\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\theta,m} \bar{\varphi}_{\theta,m} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \begin{pmatrix} E [\overline{\langle \varphi_{\theta,m,1}, X_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}} + \overline{\langle \varphi_{\theta,m,2}, X_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}}] \bar{X}_{2h} \\ E [\overline{\langle \varphi_{\theta,m,1}, X_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}} + \overline{\langle \varphi_{\theta,m,2}, X_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}}] \bar{X}_{2h+1} \end{pmatrix} e^{+ih\theta} \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \begin{pmatrix} E [\langle \bar{\varphi}_{\theta,m,1}, X_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle \bar{\varphi}_{\theta,m,2}, X_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] X_{2h} \\ E [\langle \bar{\varphi}_{\theta,m,1}, X_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle \bar{\varphi}_{\theta,m,2}, X_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] X_{2h+1} \end{pmatrix} e^{+ih\theta} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{-\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{-\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{-\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{-\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{pmatrix} (\bar{\varphi}_{\theta,m}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\lambda_{\theta,m}$ and $\bar{\varphi}_{\theta,m}$ are an eigenvalue/eigenfunction pair of $\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{-\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{-\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{-\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{-\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{pmatrix}$. Now, use (3.8) to obtain $\Phi_{l,m}^t = \bar{\Phi}_{l,m}^t$, which implies that the DFPC scores $Y_{t,m}$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{t,m} &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle \bar{X}_{t-l}, \bar{\Phi}_{l,m}^t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \overline{\langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}} = \bar{Y}_{t,m}, \end{aligned}$$

and so are real for each t and m .

For part (b), first we define $Y_{t,m,n} := \sum_{l=-n}^n \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^t \rangle$. Then we use a similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 to show that $Y_{t,m,n}$ converges in mean-square to $Y_{t,m} = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^t \rangle$. Hence

$$\|E(Y_{t,m,n} \otimes Y_{t,m,n}) - E(Y_{t,m} \otimes Y_{t,m})\|_{\mathcal{S}} \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \longrightarrow \infty,$$

or equivalently,

$$|E\|Y_{t,m,n}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 - E\|Y_{t,m}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2| \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Consequently, for $t \stackrel{2}{\equiv} 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\|Y_{t,m}\|_{\mathbb{C}}^2 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} EY_{t,m,n}\bar{Y}_{t,m,n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|k| \leq n} \sum_{|l| \leq n} E \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^0 \rangle \langle \Phi_{k,m}^0, X_{t-k} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} E \langle X_{t-2l}, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle \langle \Phi_{2k,m}^0, X_{t-2k} \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} E \langle X_{t-2l}, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle \langle \Phi_{2k-1,m}^0, X_{t-2k+1} \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} E \langle X_{t-2l+1}, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle \langle \Phi_{2k,m}^0, X_{t-2k} \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} E \langle X_{t-2l+1}, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle \langle \Phi_{2k-1,m}^0, X_{t-2k+1} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l,(0,0)}^X (\Phi_{2k,m}^0), \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l,(0,1)}^X (\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0), \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l,(1,0)}^X (\Phi_{2k,m}^0), \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle C_{k-l,(1,1)}^X (\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0), \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}. \end{aligned}$$

That is the desired result for the case $t \stackrel{2}{\equiv} 0$. The case $t \stackrel{2}{\equiv} 1$ is handled in a similar way.

Part (c) is a direct result of Theorem 3.1, so we can proceed to the proof of part (d). Considering part (c) and using the results of Proposition 3 of Hörmann *et al.* (2015) lead to the desired result for $2n$ in place of n .

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2n} \text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{Y}_{2n}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2n} [\text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_1 + \mathbf{Y}_3 + \cdots + \mathbf{Y}_{2n-1}) + \text{Var}(\mathbf{Y}_2 + \mathbf{Y}_4 + \cdots + \mathbf{Y}_{2n})] \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{2} [\text{diag}(\lambda_{0,1}, \dots, \lambda_{0,p}) + \text{diag}(\lambda_{0,p+1}, \dots, \lambda_{0,2p})], \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for $2n + 1$ in place of $2n$. This completes the proof.

■

PROOFS OF THEOREMS 3.2 AND 3.3: Consider the \mathcal{H}^2 -valued mean zero stationary process $\underline{X} = \left\{ \underline{X}_t = \begin{pmatrix} X_{2t} & X_{2t+1} \end{pmatrix}', t \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$ and the filter $\{\Psi_l, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with the following matrix form

$$\Psi_l = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{2l}^0 & \Psi_{2l-1}^0 \\ \Psi_{2l+1}^1 & \Psi_{2l}^1 \end{pmatrix} : \mathcal{H}^2 \longrightarrow ((\mathbb{C}^p)^2) \mathbb{C}^{2p},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_l^t & : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^p \\ \Psi_l^t & : h \longmapsto (\langle h, \Psi_{l,1}^t \rangle, \dots, \langle h, \Psi_{l,p}^t \rangle)', \quad t = 0, 1, l \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, define the sequence of operators $\{\Upsilon_l, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with

$$\Upsilon_{-l} = \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_{2l}^0 & \Upsilon_{2l+1}^0 \\ \Upsilon_{2l-1}^1 & \Upsilon_{2l}^1 \end{pmatrix} : ((\mathbb{C}^p)^2) \mathbb{C}^{2p} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_l^t & : \mathbb{C}^p \longrightarrow \mathcal{H} \\ \Upsilon_l^t & : y \longmapsto \sum_{m=1}^p y_m \Upsilon_{l,m}^t, \quad t = 0, 1, l \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\Upsilon(B) \Psi(B) \underline{X}_t = \sum_{m=1}^p \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X}_{2t,m} \\ \tilde{X}_{2t+1,m} \end{pmatrix}.$$

On the other hand, there exist elements $\psi_q^l = (\psi_{q,1}^l \ \psi_{q,2}^l)'$ and $v_q^l = (v_{q,1}^l \ v_{q,2}^l)'$, $q = 1, \dots, 2p$, in \mathcal{H}^2 , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_l(h) & = \Psi_l((h_1, h_2)') = (\langle h, \psi_1^l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2}, \dots, \langle h, \psi_{2p}^l \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2})' \\ & = (\langle h_1, \psi_{1,1}^l \rangle + \langle h_2, \psi_{1,2}^l \rangle, \dots, \langle h_1, \psi_{2p,1}^l \rangle + \langle h_2, \psi_{2p,2}^l \rangle)', \quad \forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{-l}(y) & = \Upsilon_{-l}((y_1, y_2)') \\ & = \sum_{m=1}^p y_{1,m} v_m^l + \sum_{m=1}^p y_{2,m} v_{m+p}^l, \quad \forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{C}^p. \end{aligned}$$

Simple calculations lead to the following relations, valid for $m = 1, \dots, p$, which play a crucial role in the remainder of the proof:

$$\psi_m^l = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{m,1}^l \\ \psi_{m,2}^l \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{2l,m}^0 \\ \Psi_{2l-1,m}^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_{m+p}^l = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{m+p,1}^l \\ \psi_{m+p,2}^l \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{2l+1,m}^1 \\ \Psi_{2l,m}^1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$v_m^l = \begin{pmatrix} v_{m,1}^l \\ v_{m,2}^l \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_{2l,m}^0 \\ \Upsilon_{2l-1,m}^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad v_{m+p}^l = \begin{pmatrix} v_{m+p,1}^l \\ v_{m+p,2}^l \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Upsilon_{2l+1,m}^0 \\ \Upsilon_{2l,m}^1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

According to Hörmann *et al.* (2015), we can minimize

$$E \|\underline{X}_t - \Upsilon(B) \Psi(B) (\underline{X}_t)\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}^2$$

by choosing $v_{\theta,m} = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} v_m^l e^{il\theta} = \psi_{\theta,m} = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \psi_m^l e^{il\theta}$ as the m -th eigenfunctions of the spectral density operator \mathcal{F}_θ^X of the process \underline{X} . Note that \mathcal{F}_θ^X is nothing other than

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta^X(h) = \mathcal{F}_\theta^X \left(\begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(0,1)}^X \\ \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,0)}^X & \mathcal{F}_{\theta,(1,1)}^X \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \forall h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.4: We will use the continuity of each function $\lambda_{,m}$. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 7 of Hörmann *et al.* (2015). As in the proof of Theorem 3 of Hörmann *et al.* (2015), we show that $E |Y_{t,m} - \widehat{Y}_{t,m}| \rightarrow 0$. For a fixed L and $t \stackrel{2}{=} 0$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} E |Y_{t,m} - \widehat{Y}_{t,m}| &= E \left| \sum_{l=-2L-1}^{2L} \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{l \notin [-2L-1, 2L]} \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \\ (6.2) \quad &\leq E \left| \sum_{l=-2L-1}^{2L} \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| + E \left| \sum_{l \notin [-2L-1, 2L]} \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \\ &= E \left| \sum_{l=-L}^L \langle X_{t-2l}, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{l=-L}^L \langle X_{t-2l+1}, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \\ &\quad + E \left| \sum_{|l|>L} \langle X_{t-2l}, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{|l|>L} \langle X_{t-2l+1}, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it is enough to show that each of the terms appearing in (6.2) converges to zero in

probability. The first term can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left| \sum_{l=-2L-1}^{2L} \langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \\
& \leq E \sum_{l=-2L-1}^{2L} \|X_{t-l}\| \left\| \Phi_{l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^0 \right\| \\
& = E \sum_{l=-L}^L \|X_{t-2l}\| \left\| \Phi_{2l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 \right\| \\
& \quad + E \sum_{l=-L}^L \|X_{t-2l+1}\| \left\| \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0 \right\| \\
& \leq E \sum_{l=-L}^L \|X_{t-2l}\| \left(\left\| \Phi_{2l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 \right\|^2 + \left\| \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0 \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \quad + E \sum_{l=-L}^L \|X_{t-2l+1}\| \left(\left\| \Phi_{2l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 \right\|^2 + \left\| \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0 \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
(6.3) \quad & \leq 2E \sum_{l=-L}^L \left\| \underline{X}_{(\frac{t}{2}-l)} \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \left\| \left(\begin{array}{cc} \Phi_{2l,m}^0 & \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \end{array} \right)' - \left(\begin{array}{cc} \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 & \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0 \end{array} \right)' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we use (3.8) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2\pi \left\| \left(\begin{array}{cc} \Phi_{2l,m}^0 & \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \end{array} \right)' - \left(\begin{array}{cc} \widehat{\Phi}_{2l,m}^0 & \widehat{\Phi}_{2l-1,m}^0 \end{array} \right)' \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \\
& = \left\| \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\varphi_{\theta,m} - \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}) e^{-il\theta} d\theta \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} \\
& \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\varphi_{\theta,m} - \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} d\theta \\
& = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\varphi_{\theta,m} - (1 - \widehat{c}_{\theta,m} + \widehat{c}_{\theta,m}) \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} d\theta \\
& \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\varphi_{\theta,m} - \widehat{c}_{\theta,m} \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} d\theta + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|(1 - \widehat{c}_{\theta,m}) \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} d\theta \\
& = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|\varphi_{\theta,m} - \widehat{c}_{\theta,m} \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}\|_{\mathcal{H}^2} d\theta + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |1 - \widehat{c}_{\theta,m}| d\theta \\
& = : Q_1 + Q_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{c}_{\theta,m} := \frac{\langle \varphi_{\theta,m}, \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2}}{|\langle \varphi_{\theta,m}, \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}^2}|}$, $m = 1, \dots, p$. According to Lemma 3.2 of Hörmann and

Kokoszka (2010) we have the following upper bound for Q_1 :

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.4) \quad Q_1 &\leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\alpha_{\theta,m}} \left\| \mathcal{F}_{\theta}^X - \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\theta}^X \right\|_{\mathcal{L}} \wedge 2d\theta \\
&\leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\alpha_{\theta,m}} \left\| \mathcal{F}_{\theta}^X - \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\theta}^X \right\|_{\mathcal{S}} \wedge 2d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

By Condition 3.2 there is a finite subset $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K\}$ of $(-\pi, \pi]$ for which $\alpha_{\theta_1,m} = \dots = \alpha_{\theta_K,m} = 0$. Define $A(m, \epsilon) := \bigcup_{j=1}^K [\theta_j - \epsilon, \theta_j + \epsilon]$ and $M_{\epsilon}^{-1} := \min \{\alpha_{\theta,m} : \theta \in [-\pi, \pi] \setminus A(m, \epsilon)\}$. Therefore the upper bound (6.4) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\alpha_{\theta,m}} \left\| \mathcal{F}_{\theta}^X - \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\theta}^X \right\|_{\mathcal{S}} \wedge 2d\theta &\leq 4K\epsilon + 8M_{\epsilon}^2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\alpha_{\theta,m}} \left\| \mathcal{F}_{\theta}^X - \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\theta}^X \right\|_{\mathcal{S}} d\theta \\
&: = B_{n,\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, use the continuity of $\lambda_{\cdot,m}$ and Condition 3.1 and choose $\epsilon > 0$, small enough to conclude $B_{n,\epsilon}$ tends to zero in probability. Thus,

$$(6.5) \quad \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\langle \varphi_{\theta,m}, \omega \rangle - \widehat{c}(\theta) \langle \widehat{\varphi}_{\theta,m}, \omega \rangle| d\theta \longrightarrow 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

By applying similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 3 of Hörmann *et al.* (2015), we also conclude that Q_2 tends to zero in probability. Remark 2.1 entails

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left| \sum_{l=-2L-1}^{2L} \left\langle X_{t-l}, \Phi_{l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^0 \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right| \\
&\leq E \sum_{l=-2L-1}^{2L} \|X_{t-l}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \left\| \Phi_{l,m}^0 - \widehat{\Phi}_{l,m}^0 \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&\leq \frac{Q_1 + Q_2}{2\pi} \sum_{l=-2L+1}^{2L} E \|X_{t-l}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&\leq o_P(1) \frac{\sum_{l=-2L+1}^{2L} E \|X_{t-l}\|_{\mathcal{H}}}{L} \\
&\leq o_P(1) \frac{\sum_{l=-2L+1}^{2L} (E \|X_{t-l}\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L} \\
&\leq o_P(1) \frac{(4L+2) \left(\max_{0 \leq t \leq T-1} (E \|X_t\|^2) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{L} \longrightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that $E \left| \sum_{|l|>L} \langle X_{t-2l}, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{|l|>L} \langle X_{t-2l+1}, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|^2$ tends to

zero.

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left\langle \sum_{|l|>L} \langle X_{t-2l}, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle X_{t-2l+1}, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \sum_{|k|>L} \langle X_{t-2k}, \Phi_{2k,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \langle X_{t-2k+1}, \Phi_{2k-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right\rangle_{\mathbb{C}} \\
&= \sum_{|l|>L} \sum_{|k|>L} \langle E(X_{t-2l} \otimes X_{t-2k}) \Phi_{2k,m}^0, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&+ \sum_{|l|>L} \sum_{|k|>L} \langle E(X_{t-2l} \otimes X_{t-2k+1}) \Phi_{2k-1,m}^0, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&+ \sum_{|l|>L} \sum_{|k|>L} \langle E(X_{t-2l+1} \otimes X_{t-2k}) \Phi_{2k,m}^0, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&+ \sum_{|l|>L} \sum_{|k|>L} \langle E(X_{t-2l+1} \otimes X_{t-2k+1}) \Phi_{2k-1,m}^0, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}
\end{aligned}$$

Cauchy-Schwartz inequality entails

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left| \sum_{|l|>L} \langle X_{t-2l}, \Phi_{2l,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} + \sum_{|l|>L} \langle X_{t-2l+1}, \Phi_{2l-1,m}^0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{|k|>L} \sum_{|l|>L} \|C_{k-l,(0,0)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Phi_{2k,m}^0\| \|\Phi_{2l,m}^0\| \\
&+ \sum_{|k|>L} \sum_{|l|>L} \|C_{k-l,(0,1)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0\| \|\Phi_{2l,m}^0\| \\
&+ \sum_{|k|>L} \sum_{|l|>L} \|C_{k-l,(1,0)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Phi_{2k,m}^0\| \|\Phi_{2l-1,m}^0\| \\
&+ \sum_{|k|>L} \sum_{|l|>L} \|C_{k-l,(1,1)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0\| \|\Phi_{2l-1,m}^0\| \\
&= \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(0,0)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Phi_{2k,m}^0\| \|\Phi_{2(k-h),m}^0\| I\{|k| > L\} I\{|k-h| > L\} \\
&+ \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(0,1)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0\| \|\Phi_{2(k-h),m}^0\| I\{|k| > L\} I\{|k-h| > L\} \\
&+ \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(1,0)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Phi_{2k,m}^0\| \|\Phi_{2(k-h)-1,m}^0\| I\{|k| > L\} I\{|k-h| > L\} \\
&+ \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(1,1)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0\| \|\Phi_{2(k-h)-1,m}^0\| I\{|k| > L\} I\{|k-h| > L\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(0,0)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{2k,m}^0\|^2 I\{|k| > L\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{2k,m}^0\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&+ \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(0,1)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0\|^2 I\{|k| > L\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{2k,m}^0\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&+ \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(1,0)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{2k,m}^0\|^2 I\{|k| > L\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&+ \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} \|C_{h,(1,1)}^X\|_{\mathcal{L}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0\|^2 I\{|k| > L\} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\Phi_{2k-1,m}^0\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which obviously tends to zero as n tends to infinity. Using a similar argument for case $t \stackrel{2}{\equiv} 1$ completes the proof. ■

References

- Anderson, P. L. and Meerschaert, M. M. (1997). Periodic moving averages of random variables with regularly varying tails. *Annals of Statistics*, **24**, 771–785.
- Aue, A., Dubart-Norinho, D. and Hörmann, S. (2015). On the prediction of stationary functional time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **110**, 378–392.
- Brillinger, D. R. (1975). *Time Series: Data Analysis and Theory*. Holt, New York.
- Fisher, R. A. (1929). Tests of significance in harmonic analysis. *Proceedings of the Royal Society (A)*, **125**, 54–59.
- Ghanbarzadeh, M. and Aminghafari, M. (2016). A wavelet characterization of continuous-time periodically correlated processes with application to simulation. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, **37**, 741–762.
- Gromenko, O., Kokoszka, P. and Reimherr, M. (2016). Detection of change in the spatiotemporal mean function. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (B)*, **00**, 00–00; Forthcoming.
- Hays, S., Shen, H. and Huang, J. Z. (2012). Functional dynamic factor models with application to yield curve forecasting. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, **6**, 870–894.
- Hörmann, S., Kidziński, L. and Hallin, M. (2015). Dynamic functional principal components. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (B)*, **77**, 319–348.
- Hörmann, S. and Kokoszka, P. (2010). Weakly dependent functional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, **38**, 1845–1884.
- Hörmann, S., Kokoszka, P. and Nisol, G. (2016). Detection of periodicity in functional time series. Technical Report. Université libre de Bruxelles.
- Horváth, L. and Kokoszka, P. (2012). *Inference for Functional Data with Applications*. Springer.

- Horváth, L., Kokoszka, P. and Rice, G. (2014). Testing stationarity of functional time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, **179**, 66–82.
- Hurd, H. L. (1989). Nonparametric time series analysis for periodically correlated processes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **35**, 350–359.
- Hurd, H. L. and Miamee, A. (2007). *Periodically Correlated Random Sequences*. Wiley.
- Javorskyj, I., Leškow, J., Kravets, I., Isayev, I. and Gajecka, E. (2012). Linear filtration methods for statistical analysis of periodically correlated random processes-part I: Coherent and component methods and their generalization. *Signal Processing*, **92**, 1559 – 1566.
- Klepsch, J., Klüppelberg, C. and Wei, T. (2017). Prediction of functional ARMA processes with an application to traffic data. *Econometrics and Statistics*, **00**, 000–000; Forthcoming.
- Kokoszka, P. and Reimherr, M. (2017). *Introduction to Functional Data Analysis*. CRC Press.
- Lund, R., Hurd, H., Bloomfield, P. and Smith, R. (1995). Climatological time series with periodic correlation. *Journal of Climate*, **8**, 410–427.
- Panaretos, V. M. and Tavakoli, S. (2013a). Cramér–Karhunen–Loève representation and harmonic principal component analysis of functional time series. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, **123**, 2779–2807.
- Panaretos, V. M. and Tavakoli, S. (2013b). Fourier analysis of stationary time series in function space. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 568–603.
- Ramsay, J., Hooker, G. and Graves, S. (2009). *Functional Data Analysis with R and MATLAB*. Springer.
- Walker, G. (1914). On the criteria for the reality of relationships or periodicities. *Calcutta Ind. Met. Memo*, **21**, number 9.
- Zamani, A., Haghbin, H. and Shishebor, Z. (2016). Some tests for detecting cyclic behavior in functional time series with application in climate change. Technical report. Shiraz University.
- Zhang, X. (2016). White noise testing and model diagnostic checking for functional time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, **194**, 76–95.