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Abstract

Relational arrays represent interactions or associations between pairs of actors, often in varied contexts or over time. Such data appear as, for example, trade flows between countries, financial transactions between individuals, contact frequencies between school children in classrooms, and dynamic protein-protein interactions. This paper proposes and evaluates a new class of parameter standard error estimators for models that represent elements of a relational array as a linear function of observable covariates. Uncertainty estimates for regression coefficients must account for both heterogeneity across actors and dependence arising from relations involving the same actor. Existing estimators of parameter standard errors that recognize such relational dependence rely on estimating extremely complex, heterogeneous structure across actors. Leveraging an exchangeability assumption, we derive parsimonious standard error estimators that pool information across actors and are substantially more accurate than existing estimators in a variety of settings. This exchangeability assumption is pervasive in network and array models in the statistics literature, but not previously considered when adjusting for dependence in a regression setting with relational data. We show that our estimator outperforms the current state-of-the-art estimator in mean-square error and demonstrate improvements in inference through simulation and a data set involving international trade.
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1 Introduction

Measurable relationships between pairs of actors are often represented as relational arrays. A relational array $Y = \{ y_{ij}^{(r)} : i, j \in \{1, ..., n\}, i \neq j, r \in \{1, ..., R\} \}$ is composed of a series of $R$ $(n \times n)$ matrices, each of which describes the directed pairwise relationships among $n$ actors of type $r$, e.g. time period $r$ or relation context $r$. The diagonal elements of each matrix $\{ y_{ii}^{(r)} : i \in \{1, ..., n\} \}$ are assumed to be undefined, as we do not consider actor relations with his/herself. Examples of data that can be represented as a relational array include annual flows of migrants between countries and daily interactions among school children over the course of a week. In economics, relational arrays can also describe monetary transfers between individuals as part of informal insurance markets (see, for example, Bardham (1984); Fafchamps (2006); Foster and Rosenzweig (2001); Attanasio et al. (2012); Banerjee et al. (2013)). Data sets represented as a single matrix of relations, i.e. $R = 1$, are also considered here. These data sets are extremely common in the social and biological sciences, and in these cases, the array $Y$ is often simply referred to as a weighted network. The data sets we consider are in contrast to those where the response is a vector of actors which are connected in a possibly unknown network, for example see Zhou and Song (2016).

We consider regression models that express the entries in a relational array as a linear function of observable covariates:

$$ y_{ij}^{(r)} = \beta^T x_{ij}^{(r)} + \xi_{ij}^{(r)}, \quad i, j \in \{1, ..., n\}, i \neq j, \quad r \in \{1, ..., R\}. $$

Here $y_{ij}^{(r)}$ is a (continuous) directed measure of the $r$th relation from actor $i$ to actor $j$ and $x_{ij}^{(r)}$ is a $(p \times 1)$ vector of covariates, which are unrelated (i.e. exogenous) to the mean-zero error $\xi_{ij}^{(r)}$. In a study on international trade, $y_{ij}^{(r)}$ may denote the value of trade exported from country $i$ to country $j$ in year $r$ and the covariates may include country-specific attributes such as GDP and population, as well as country pair characteristics such as geographic distance. We particularly consider applications where inference for the coefficient vector $\beta$ is
the primary goal in the analysis. Taking again informal insurance markets, Fafchamps and Gubert (2007) examine how covariates such as geographical proximity and kinship relate to risk sharing relations after economic shocks. Recent extensions of this work (e.g. Aker (2010); Blumenstock et al. (2011); Jack and Suri (2014)) explore the strength of the association between physical proximity and financial transactions among individuals with access to mobile phones. Throughout the paper, we assume that relations are directed such that the relationship from actor $i$ to actor $j$ may differ than that from $j$ to $i$, however, the methods we propose extend to the undirected/symmetric relation case in a straightforward manner. We discuss the extension to undirected arrays in Appendix A.

A core statistical challenge in modeling relational arrays arises from the innate dependencies among relations involving the same actor. For example, dependence often exists between trade relations involving the same country and between economic transfers originating from the same individual. In many cases, we expect this dependence may be absent the observable covariates and manifest in the errors. This dependence may arise, for example, from differences in gregariousness between individuals or, in the informal insurance markets, individual differences in risk aversion. Substantial dependence in the errors precludes the use of standard regression techniques for inference. While unbiased estimation for the $\beta$ coefficients in (1) is possible via ordinary least squares (OLS), accurate uncertainty quantification for $\beta$, i.e. standard errors, requires consideration and estimation of any auxiliary dependence. Approaches for addressing this challenge have appeared in the statistics, biostatistics, and econometrics literatures and can be characterized into two broad classes.

The first set of approaches impose a parametric model on the errors. Specifically, they either use latent variables to model the array measurements as conditionally independent given the latent structure (e.g. see Holland et al. (1983); Wang and Wong (1987); Hoff et al. (2002); Hoff (2005)) or model the error covariance structure directly subject to a set of simplifying assumptions (e.g. see Hoff et al. (2011); Fosdick and Hoff (2014); Hoff et al. (2015)). While these methods provide parsimonious representations of the underlying error
structure, the accuracy of inference on $\beta$ depends on the extent to which the true error structure is consistent with the specified parametric model.

The second approach to accounting for error dependence relies heavily on empirical estimates of the error structure based on the residuals in an estimating equation/moment condition framework. In contrast to the first approach, this framework typically makes few assumptions about the data generating process and utilizes a sandwich covariance estimator for the standard errors of the regression coefficients. Sandwich estimators employ the regression residuals to “adjust” the standard error estimate in case the moment conditions are misspecified or there is dependence structure within the errors. As a result, the sandwich estimator is commonly known as a robust estimator of the standard error. The quality of this correction depends on the accuracy of the error covariance estimate based on the residuals. In practice, current error covariance estimators for relational regression are hindered by the need to estimate a tremendous number of covariance parameters with minimal, noisy observations. These practical limitations have been recognized in other contexts (see King and Roberts (2014) for a discussion) and is the reason why Wakefield (2013) suggests such estimators be labeled “empirical” rather than “robust.”

In this paper, we extend the estimating equation/moment condition framework by incorporating an assumption implicit in many of the model-based approaches. Let $Y^{(r)}$ denote the $r^{th}$ $(n \times n)$ matrix slice in the array containing all relations of type $r$. We propose leveraging an exchangeability assumption within, and potentially across, each matrix $Y^{(r)}$ to derive parsimonious estimates of the relational dependence. Our approach produces a dramatically simplified estimator that results in superior performance in inference, which we demonstrate both theoretically and empirically in simulation studies.

This paper is organized as follows. The remainder of this section provides background on the estimating equation framework in the context of relational data. Section 2 describes current inference approaches arising from the network econometrics literature and literature on moment condition estimators with cross-sectional dependence, focusing specifically on
data sets where $R = 1$ (e.g. Conley (1999); Hansen (2015)). We discuss what it means for relational data to be exchangeable in Section 3 and present our proposed covariance matrix estimator based on an exchangeability assumption. Section 4 describes the improvements in mean-square error of our proposed method compared to the current state of practice, as supported by extensive theoretical results and simulation evidence. We discuss extensions of our method for use with arrays with $R > 1$ in Section 5 and demonstrate our methodology using a data set of international trade flow in Section 6. We conclude with a discussion in Section 7.

1.1 Accounting for correlated errors in relational regression

A key statistical challenge in relational regression is accounting for the correlation structure present in the $n \times n \times R$ array of error terms $\Xi = \{\xi_{ij}^{(r)} : i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, i \neq j, r \in \{1, \ldots, R\}\}$. First, consider a single matrix of relations $Y^{(r)} = \{y_{ij}^{(r)} : i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, i \neq j\}$ and error matrix $\Xi^{(r)}$ corresponding to relation type $r$. There are two primary types of correlation we might expect among the errors. The first type is between relations within the same row or within the same column of the matrix $\Xi^{(r)}$. Revisiting the international trade example, this dependence corresponds to correlation among a country’s exports (i.e. within a row of $\Xi^{(r)}$) and correlation among a country’s imports (i.e. within a column of $\Xi^{(r)}$). These dependence patterns are often seen in array data in general, even when each dimension of the array is distinct (Hoff et al. (2011); Fosdick and Hoff (2014)). The second type of correlation we expect, which is specific to relational data, stems from the fact that the row and column index sets represent the same entities. Again, in the context of the trade data, we might expect France’s exports to Germany to depend upon the amount Spain exports to France. This corresponds to dependence between errors, say, $\xi_{ij}^{(r)}$ and $\xi_{ki}^{(r)}$.

We use an estimating equations/moment conditions framework (see, for example, Wakefield (2013); Hansen (2015)) to perform inference on $\beta$. In relational regression, estimating equations $g$ are defined such that for all $(i, j, r)$, $E\left[g(y_{ij}^{(r)}, \beta)\right] = 0_p$, where $0_p$ is the $p$-
dimensional vector of zeros. The estimator \( \hat{\beta} \) is then defined as that which satisfies

\[
G(Y, \hat{\beta}) := \sum_{i,j,r} g(y_{ij}^{(r)}, \hat{\beta}) = 0_p. \tag{2}
\]

The estimating equations \( g \) characterize specific features of the population distribution (e.g. the first moment), but critically, this approach does not fully specify the population distribution.

Consider the relational regression model as defined in [1]. There are many \( g \) functions one could specify which would provide reasonable \( \beta \) estimates. One common specification is (see, for example, Chapter 11 in Hansen (2015) or Chapter 5 in Wakefield (2013))

\[
g(y_{ij}^{(r)}, \beta) = x_{ij}^{(r)} \left( y_{ij}^{(r)} - \beta^T x_{ij}^{(r)} \right). \tag{3}
\]

This corresponds to the score function of the multivariate normal likelihood assuming homoskedastic, independent errors and gives rise to the familiar ordinary least squares estimate of \( \hat{\beta} \):

\[
\hat{\beta} = \left( X^T X \right)^{-1} X^T Y_v,
\]

where \( X \) is an \( (n(n-1) R \times p) \) matrix of covariate vectors \( \{x_{ij}^{(r)}\} \) and \( Y_v \) is a vectorized representation of \( Y \). Under regularity conditions (see Van der Vaart (2000) and Cameron et al. (2011), for example), the estimator satisfying (2) is consistent \( (\hat{\beta} \rightarrow_p \beta) \) and moreover asymptotically normal:

\[
\sqrt{n} \left( \hat{\beta} - \beta \right) \rightarrow_d N \left( 0_p, A^{-1} B (A^T)^{-1} \right), \tag{4}
\]

where \( A = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} G(Y, \beta) \right] \) and \( B = \mathbb{E} \left[ G(Y, \beta) G(Y, \beta)^T \right] \), such that \( G(Y, \beta) \) is as defined in [2]. Estimating the asymptotic variance of \( \hat{\beta} \) then amounts to estimating \( A \) and \( B \). Asymptotic covariance estimators of the form \( \hat{A}^{-1} \hat{B}(\hat{A}^T)^{-1} \) are commonly referred to as “sandwich” estimators (Huber (1967); White (1980)). Assuming independence across observations, the
elements of the covariance can be estimated as

$$\hat{A} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)R} \sum_{i,j,r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta^T} g(y_{ij}^{(r)}, \hat{\beta})$$

and

$$\hat{B} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)R} \sum_{i,j,r} g(y_{ij}^{(r)}, \hat{\beta}) g(y_{ij}^{(r)}, \hat{\beta})^T.$$  

When $g$ is defined as in (3) for relational data, $A = X^T X$ and $B = X^T \Omega X$, where

$$\Omega = V[Y_v|X]$$

is the covariance matrix of the relations, equivalently the errors. $\Omega$ appears in the form of the variance for most $g$ functions commonly used to estimate $\beta$. When observations are independent and homoskedastic, $\Omega$ is proportional to the identity matrix and the form of the variance simplifies to that from standard linear regression. However, independence among the errors is often violated in relational data as we expect relations involving the same actor(s) will be dependent. More complex covariance structures have been considered that assume only subsets of the observations be independent. These independent subsets are often specified based on distance metrics derived from observable features of the data (see, e.g., White and Domowitz (1984); Liang and Zeger (1986); Conley (1999)). In the next section, we discuss in detail the estimators proposed for relational data.

2 Dyadic clustering estimator

To facilitate presentation, we first describe the current state-of-the-art sandwich covariance estimation framework with a single relation $Y^{(1)}$, then move to arrays with $R > 1$. For notational simplicity, we presently drop the superscript $(1)$ indexing the relation type and reintroduce it in Section 5 when needed. Thus, $y_{ij} = y_{ij}^{(1)}$, $x_{ij} = x_{ij}^{(1)}$, $Y_v$ is an $n(n-1) \times 1$ vector of relational observations in $Y^{(1)}$, and $X$ is the $n(n-1) \times p$ matrix of covariates for these relations.

Consider a ordered pair $(i, j)$ and define $\Theta_{ij}$ as the set consisting of all ordered pairs that contain an overlapping member with the pair $(i, j)$. In other words, $\Theta_{ij} = \{(k, l) : \{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset\}$. Generalizing the standard estimating equation framework, Fafchamps and Gubert (2007), Cameron et al. (2011), and Aronow et al. (2015) propose and describe
the properties of a flexible standard error estimator for relational regression which makes
the sole assumption that two relations \((i, j)\) and \((k, l)\) are independent if \((i, j)\) and \((k, l)\) do
not share an actor (i.e. \((k, l) \not\in \Theta_{ij}\)). This implies that \(\text{Cov}(y_{ij}, y_{kl}|X) =
\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kl}) = 0\) for non-overlapping pairs, but places no restrictions on the covariance elements for pairs
that involve the same actor. Let \(\Omega_{DC}\) denote the covariance matrix \(V[Y_v|X]\) subject to
this non-overlapping pair independence assumption. Fafchamps and Gubert (2007) propose
estimating each nonzero entry of \(\Omega_{DC}\) with a product of residuals, e.g. \(\hat{\text{Cov}}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ik}) = e_{ij}e_{ik}\).
This may be expressed in matrix form as

\[
\hat{\Omega}_{DC} = ee^T \circ 1_{[i,j] \cap \{k,l\} \neq \emptyset}, \tag{5}
\]

where \(e\) is the vector of residuals \(\{e_{ij} = y_{ij} - \hat{\beta}^T x_{ij}\}\) for all relations, \(1_{[i,j] \cap \{k,l\} \neq \emptyset}\) is an
\((n(n-1) \times n(n-1))\) matrix of indicators denoting which relation pairs share an actor, and
‘\(\circ\)’ denotes the matrix Hadamard (entry-wise) product. The estimator \(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}\) can be seen as
that which takes the empirical covariance of the residuals defined by \(ee^T\) and systematically
introduces zeros to enforce the non-overlapping pair independence assumption. We refer to
the covariance estimator \(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}\) as the dyadic clustering (DC) covariance estimator as it
owes its derivation to the extensive literature on “cluster-robust” standard error estimates.
Restricting the covariances in \(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}\) between non-overlapping relations to be zero makes this
estimator similar to that resulting from a two-way clustering approach which clusters on
each relation sender (i.e. the rows of \(\Xi\)) and also clusters on each relation receiver (i.e. the
columns of \(\Xi\)).

When the \(\beta\) estimator is that based on ordinary least squares (i.e. that associated with
\(\hat{\beta}\)), Fafchamps and Gubert (2007) propose a sandwich variance estimator for \(V[\hat{\beta}]\) based
on the DC covariance estimator, which is equal to

\[
\hat{V}_{DC} = (X^TX)^{-1}X^T\hat{\Omega}_{DC}X(X^TX)^{-1}. \tag{6}
\]
We will refer to this as the DC estimator of $V[\hat{\beta}]$. Aronow et al. (2015) show that $\hat{V}_{DC}$ is consistent by showing that as the number of actors $n$ grows, the number independent pairs of actors grows with $n^4$ whereas the number of dependent pairs grows with $n^3$.

We contend that while the DC estimator of the variance in (6) is widely used, asymptotically consistent, and theoretically robust to a wide range of error dependence structures (making minimal assumptions), its utility is limited in practice for several reasons. First, the DC estimator estimates $O(n^3)$ covariance parameters from only $O(n^2)$ residuals. Even for relational matrices of moderate size, estimating this number of parameters is onerous computationally and statistically. Second, the DC approach estimates each nonzero covariance element separately with a single residual product: e.g. $\hat{\text{Cov}}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ik}) = e_{ij}e_{ik}$. When there is substantial heterogeneity in the covariance structure, estimating each element individually in this way may be appropriate. However, the variability of these estimates is extreme since each is based on a single observation of the pair.

3 Standard errors with exchangeability

In this section, we propose a novel estimator for $V[\hat{\beta}]$ that leverages an exchangeability assumption in the estimation of $\Omega$. In short, this assumption induces structure among portions of the covariance matrix $\Omega$ corresponding to subsets of the relations with a similar arrangement, and pools information within these subsets. For this section, we continue discussion in terms of data sets containing a single relation $Y = Y^{(1)}$, and discuss extensions of our proposed methodology to arrays in Section 5.

3.1 Exchangeability in relational models

A common modeling assumption for relational and array structured errors is exchangeability. Defined by de Finetti for a univariate sequence of random variables, exchangeability was generalized to array data and relational data by Hoover (1979) and Aldous (1981). The
Figure 1: Five distinguishable configurations of relation pairs involving the bold orange relation in an exchangeable relational model: (a) reciprocal relations; (b) relations share common sender; (c) relations share common receiver; (d) shared actor is the sender of one relation and receiver of the other; (e) no shared actors among the two relations.

Errors in a relational data model are jointly exchangeable if the probability distribution of the error array, \( \Xi \), is invariant under any permutation of the rows and columns. Mathematically, this means

\[
P(\Xi) = P(\Pi(\Xi)),
\]

where \( \Pi(\Xi) = \{\xi_{\pi(i)\pi(j)}\} \) is the error array with its rows and columns reordered according to permutation operator \( \pi \). Intuitively, exchangeability in the context of linear regression on an array simply means the observed covariates are sufficiently informative such that the ordering of the row and column labeling in the error array is uninformative. Each of the conditionally independent parametric network models discussed in the introduction have this joint exchangeability property (see Hoff (2008) and Bickel and Chen (2009) for further discussion).

### 3.2 Impact of exchangeability on covariance structure

Under exchangeability, the covariance matrix \( \Omega \) has at most six unique elements. To see this result intuitively, note that any relation has five distinguishable types of covariance configurations involving another relation, plus one variance term associated with the relation itself. Figure 1 shows the five distinguishable configurations of relation pairs that comprise the covariance structure. If a probability model for \( \Xi \) is jointly exchangeable, then all entries \( \xi_{ij} \) are marginally identically distributed under the model. This implies that each of the covariances corresponding to a particular configuration in Figure 1 (plus the variance term)
should have the same value across all possible actor labels. Stating this result formally, we have the following.

**Proposition 1.** If a probability model for a directed relational matrix $\Xi$ is jointly exchangeable and has finite second moments, then the covariance matrix of $\Xi$ contains at most six unique values.

**Proof:** Consider a probability model for a directed relational matrix $\Xi$ that satisfies the joint exchangeability and second moment criteria defined above. For any four, possibly non-unique, actors $\{i, j, k, l\}$, observe that the covariance between the errors $\xi_{ij}$ and $\xi_{kl}$ takes one of the following six values, depending on the relationships between the actor indices:

- $\text{Var}(\xi_{ij})$ if $i = k$ and $j = l$;
- $\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kj})$ if $i \neq k$ and $j = l$;
- $\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ji})$ if $i = l$ and $j = k$;
- $\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ki})$ if $i = l$ and $j \neq k$;
- $\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ii})$ if $i = k$ and $j \neq l$;
- $\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kl})$ if $i \neq k$ and $j \neq l$.

Now consider an arbitrary permutation operation $\pi(\cdot)$ of the entire actor set $\{1, ..., n\}$. Note that exchangeability implies the bivariate distribution of the pair $(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kl})$ must be the same as distribution of $(\xi_{\pi(i)\pi(j)}, \xi_{\pi(k)\pi(l)})$. Thus, the covariance of $\xi_{\pi(i)\pi(j)}$ and $\xi_{\pi(k)\pi(l)}$ must equal that of the original pair:

$$\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kl}) = \text{Cov}(\xi_{\pi(i)\pi(j)}, \xi_{\pi(k)\pi(l)}) \quad \text{for any } i, j, k, l.$$ 

By exchangeability this is true for all permutations $\pi(\cdot)$, establishing the result. □

To illustrate the correspondence between joint exchangeability and the covariance entries, consider the bilinear mixed effects network regression model proposed in Hoff (2005). This model uses an inner product measure to model the error structure in relations and can be
expressed as follows:

\[ y_{ij} = \beta^T x_{ij} + \xi_{ij}; \quad \xi_{ij} = a_i + b_j + z_i^T z_j + \gamma_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij}; \quad (7) \]

\[ (a_i, b_i) \sim N_2(0, \Sigma_{ab}); \quad \Sigma_{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_a^2 & \rho_a \sigma_a \sigma_b \\ \rho_a \sigma_a \sigma_b & \sigma_b^2 \end{pmatrix}; \]

\[ z_i, z_j \sim N_d(0, \sigma_z^2 I_d); \quad \gamma_{ij} = \gamma_{ji} \sim N(0, \sigma_\gamma^2); \quad \epsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2). \]

where \( a_i, b_j, z_i, z_j, \) and \( \epsilon_{ij} \) are independent. Note that \( \mathbb{E}[\xi_{ij}] = 0. \)

As presented in [Hoff (2005)], the elements of \( V[\Xi_v] = V[Y_v | X] \) are

- \( \text{Var}(\xi_{ij}) = \sigma_a^2 + \sigma_b^2 + \sigma_z^2 + \sigma_\gamma^2 + \sigma_\epsilon^2, \)
- \( \text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ji}) = \sigma^2, \)
- \( \text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{il}) = \sigma_a^2, \)
- \( \text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kj}) = \sigma_b^2, \)
- \( \text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ki}) = \text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{jk}) = \rho \sigma_a \sigma_b. \)
- \( \text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kl}) = 0, \)

Note that there are six unique terms, corresponding to the five relation pair configurations shown in Figure I and a variance term. Moreover, these terms depend only on the population-level parameters of the data generating process and not on individual-level latent variables.

Like the results in [Hoff (2005)], our work draws on a much deeper, general literature on variance decompositions for structured and symmetric models. In regard to symmetry, a related notion to exchangeability, [Dawid (1988)] states that “the specification of the relevant symmetry represents a pre-modelling phase from which many important consequences flow.”

Our work leverages these symmetries, assuming only, again quoting [Dawid (1988)], that there is “no reason to consider the observations in any one order rather than any other.” Work by [Li and Loken (2002), Li et al. (2002), and Li (2006)] generalize the social relations model (SRM) of [Warner et al. (1979)] to describe the family of symmetric probability distributions for dyadic data. Though these approaches confirm our findings on the gains of assuming exchangeability, their approach to modeling the covariance structure is quite different. These
approaches draw inspiration from the variance decomposition literature in statistics. This motivation leads to developing hypothesis tests that explore restrictions on the symmetries (i.e., invariance to transformations) as a null hypothesis, but impose a parametric form on the error terms (e.g., involving sender, receiver, and pairwise effects in the Warner et al. (1979) social relations model) and in some cases assume a Gaussian likelihood. In contrast, our motivation comes from econometric methods for nonparametric standard error estimation. As a result, we leverage the exchangeability assumption only to simplify the existing estimating equation uncertainty estimates, rather than attempt to fully specify a probability distribution for the data.

3.3 Covariance matrices of exchangeable relational arrays

Proposition 1 implies that at most six parameters are required to describe the dependence structure arising from jointly exchangeable relational models. Thus, we introduce a new class of covariance matrices $\Omega_E$ which contain five unique nonzero entries: one variance parameter $\sigma^2$ along the diagonal of $\Omega_E$ and four covariance parameters $\{\phi_a, \phi_b, \phi_c, \phi_d\}$ associated with (a-d) in Figure 1. Similar to the DC covariance model, we assume non-overlapping directed pairs are independent, such that $\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kl}) = 0$, corresponding to (e) in Figure 1 and implying $\phi_e = 0$. Though there may be association between non-overlapping pairs, we expect this dependence to be small compared to dependence between pairs that share a member such that our assumption is reasonable. Figure 2 shows the structure of $\Omega_E$ for a relational matrix with four actors $\{A, B, C, D\}$. We formally define the class $\Omega_E$ below.

**Definition 1.** An exchangeable covariance matrix is defined as $\Omega_E = \mathbb{E}[\Xi_v \Xi_v^T]$ arising from mean-zero random vector $\Xi_v = \text{vec}(\Xi)$, where $\Xi$ is a jointly exchangeable random matrix with $\xi_{ij}$ independent $\xi_{kl}$ whenever $\{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset$. $\Omega_E$ has five unique terms consisting of a variance and four covariances: $\{\sigma^2, \phi_a, \phi_b, \phi_c, \phi_d\}$.

We now present a theorem that states that, for a linear model with error covariance matrix in the class of $\Omega_E$, the OLS estimate of the coefficients $\beta$ is asymptotically normal. Our
Consider a matrix $Y$ containing the relations among four actors $\{A, B, C, D\}$ shown on the left. Since the relation between an actor and itself is undefined, the diagonal entries (blacked out in the picture) are not regarded as part of $Y$. Assuming joint exchangeability of the actors and that relations involving non-overlapping sets of actors are independent, the covariance matrix $\Omega_E$ contains five unique values.

The asymptotic regime is the addition of actors to the relational data set, leading to asymptotics in $n$, where we treat the matrix $X$ as a random variable. To examine the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\beta}$, we must make some assumptions about the distribution of $X$. As each covariate pertains to entries in a relational array, it is natural to assume that there may be dependence among the rows in $X$. In the context of trade between countries, for example, if scalar $x_{jk}^{(1)}$ measures the difference in GDP between France ($j$) and Germany ($k$), we expect the difference in GDP between Spain ($l$) and France, $x_{lj}^{(1)}$, to be correlated with the former $x_{jk}^{(1)}$. Thus, we assume the rows of the matrix $X$ are jointly exchangeable, meaning that a reordering of the rows $\{x_{jk}\}_{j,k=1}^n$ to $\{x_{\pi(j)\pi(k)}\}_{j,k=1}^n$ leaves the distribution of matrix $X$ invariant for any permutation $\pi(\cdot)$. As with the dependence in the errors, we assume that two rows of $X$ that correspond to relations which do not share an actor are independent, that is row $x_{ij}^T$ is independent row $x_{kl}^T$ whenever $\{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset$. This dependence in the rows of matrix $X$
(along with some assumptions on the finiteness of its moments) implies the following:

$$
\sum_{(jk,lm) \in \Theta_i} \frac{x_{jk}x_{lm}^T}{|\Theta_i|} \xrightarrow{p} M_i, \quad i \in \{0, a, b, c, d\},
$$

(8)

where $\Theta_i$ is the set of pairs of relations $(jk, lm)$ that share a member in the $i^{th}$ manner and ‘0’ refers to self-relation (i.e. variance).

**Theorem 1.** Define the following data generating process:

(A1) The true data generating model is $Y_v = X\beta + \Xi_v$, where the errors $\Xi_v$ are mean-zero with exchangeable covariance matrix as defined in Definition 7.

(A2) At least one of $\{\phi_b, \phi_c, \phi_d\}$ is nonzero.

In addition, consider the following regularity conditions:

(B1) The covariate matrix $X$ has rows that are jointly exchangeable with at least one of $\{M_i\}_{i \in \{b,c,d\}}$ in (8) nonzero, and where row $x_{ij}^T$ is independent row $x_{kl}^T$ whenever $\{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset$.

(B2) The fourth moments of each the errors and the covariates are bounded: $E[|\xi_{jk}|^4] < C < \infty$ and $\max_{l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p\}} E[|x_{(l)jk}|^4] < C' < \infty$ where $x_{jk} = [x_{(1)jk}, \ldots, x_{(p)jk}]^T$.

(B3) The errors $\Xi$ and covariates $X$ are independent.

(B4) $X$ is full rank.

Given (A1) – (A2) and (B1) – (B4), the ordinary least squares estimate $\hat{\beta}$ is asymptotically normal:

$$
\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \rightarrow_d N(0, M_0^{-1}(\phi_bM_b + \phi_cM_c + 2\phi_dM_d)M_0^{-1}),
$$

where $\{M_i\}_{i \in \{0,b,c,d\}}$ are as in (8) and ‘$\rightarrow_d$’ denotes element-wise convergence in distribution.
The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix B. Note that only the covariances \( \{\phi_b, \phi_c, \phi_d\} \) appear in asymptotic variance of \( \hat{\beta} \). This results from the fact that there are an order of magnitude more of terms \( \{\phi_b, \phi_c, \phi_d\} \) in the covariance matrix \( \Omega_E \) than there are of the terms \( \{\phi_a, \sigma^2\} \). In particular, in \( \Omega_E \) there are \( n(n-1)(n-2) \) pairs of relations \( (\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kl}) \) of each of type (b) and type (c), \( 2n(n-1)(n-2) \) pairs of type (d), and \( n(n-1) \) pairs of each of type (a) and \( \sigma^2 \). We make the assumption that at least one of the covariances \( \{\phi_b, \phi_c, \phi_d\} \) is nonzero. Should the assumption be violated, then all \( \binom{n}{2} \) dyadic pairs of the form \( (\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ji}) \) are independent of one another, and the asymptotic normality of \( \hat{\beta} \) follows from the usual independent data arguments. In this case, the asymptotic normality of \( \hat{\beta} \) is of rate \( n \) with asymptotic variance \( M_0^{-1} (\sigma^2 M_0 + \phi_a M_a) M_0^{-1} \). The canonical case of independent and identically distributed errors is recovered when \( \phi_a = \phi_b = \phi_c = \phi_d = 0 \). In the canonical case, \( \hat{\beta} \) has asymptotic variance \( \sigma^2 M_0^{-1} \) occurring at rate \( n \). Note that both of these final cases are rate \( n \) (and not \( \sqrt{n} \)) since there are \( n(n-1) \) entries in \( Y_v \).

### 3.4 Exchangeable covariance estimator

As emphasized above, the DC estimators in (5) and (6) estimate each nonzero element in \( \Omega_{DC} \) using a single product of residuals. Here we introduce novel estimators inspired by the covariance structure \( \Omega_E \) associated with relations are jointly exchangeable. Specifically we consider estimates of \( \Omega \) in the class of exchangeable covariance matrices, as in Definition 1.

Our new exchangeable (EXCH) covariance estimator \( \hat{\Omega}_E \), and corresponding estimator of \( V[\hat{\beta}] \) can be written, respectively, as

\[
\hat{\Omega}_E = \hat{\sigma}^2 I_{n(n-1)} + \sum_{s=a}^{d} \hat{\phi}_s S_s, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{V}_E = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \hat{\Omega}_E X (X^T X)^{-1},
\]

where \( S_s \) denotes the \( (n(n-1) \times n(n-1)) \) binary matrix with 1s in the entries corresponding to relation pairs of type \( s \in \{a, b, c, d\} \) as defined in Figure 1.

We propose estimating the five parameters in \( \Omega_E \) by averaging the residual products.
across pairs having the same index configurations corresponding to (a)-(d) in Figure 1. These empirical mean estimates can be expressed

- \( \hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} e_{ij}^2 \);
- \( \hat{\phi}_b = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} e_{ij} \left( \sum_{k \neq j} e_{kj} - e_{ij} \right) \);
- \( \hat{\phi}_a = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} e_{ij} e_{ji} \);
- \( \hat{\phi}_c = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} e_{ij} \left( \sum_{k \neq i} e_{ik} - e_{ij} \right) \);
- \( \hat{\phi}_d = \frac{1}{2n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} e_{ij} \left( \sum_{k \neq i} e_{ki} + \sum_{k \neq j} e_{jk} - 2e_{ji} \right) \).

We implement the above estimator, along with many methods to follow in this paper, in the R software package netregR \cite{Marrs2018}.

Even if the underlying data generating model is not jointly exchangeable, the proposed estimator will work well if the variability in the covariances among relations of the same type (i.e. (a)-(d) in Figure 1) is small. In this case, it is likely that the reduction in estimation variance that arises from pooling will outweigh the small bias introduced in the estimation of each covariance entry.

### 4 Evaluating the exchangeable estimator

In this section, we theoretically and empirically evaluate the properties of our estimators in (9) for data with a single matrix of relations (i.e. \( R = 1 \)). We first prove that our variance estimator \( \hat{V}_E \) is consistent for the true variance of \( \hat{\beta} \) when the data generating process is jointly exchangeable. Then, in the spirit of, for example, Kauermann and Carroll \cite{KauermannCarroll2001}, we show that the mean-square error (MSE) of \( \hat{V}_E \) is lower than that of \( \hat{V}_{DC} \) with high probability.

We then present simulation evidence of improved inference for \( \hat{\beta} \) by simulating data from both exchangeable and non-exchangeable generative models.

#### 4.1 Consistency of \( \hat{V}_E \)

We begin theoretical justification of our estimator with the following theorem, which states that exchangeable covariance estimator is consistent for the true variance of the coefficients,
as the number of actors increases.

**Theorem 2.** Under the conditions of Theorem 1, the exchangeable covariance estimator is consistent in the sense that

\[ n \hat{V}_E - n V[\hat{\theta}] \to_p 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \quad (10) \]

where ‘\( \to_p \)’ denotes element-wise convergence in probability.

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Appendix C.

### 4.2 MSE of \( \hat{V}_{DC} \) and \( \hat{V}_E \)

We continue our theoretical justification of our estimator by showing that the MSE of the exchangeable covariance estimator \( V_E \) is lower than that of the dyadic clustering covariance estimator \( V_{DC} \) with high probability. We evaluate the MSE conditional on \( X \), and then evaluate the probability that the difference is positive for random \( X \). We show that the probability that the MSE of the exchangeable estimator is less than that of the dyadic clustering estimator tends to 1 as \( n \) tends to infinity.

**Theorem 3.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 and for covariate matrix \( X \) with bounded eighth moments, that is \( \max_{l \in \{1,2,\ldots,p\}} \mathbb{E} \left( |x_{jk}^{(l)}|^8 \right) < C' < \infty \), the MSE of the exchangeable estimator is less than that of the dyadic clustering estimator with probability approaching 1, that is

\[ \mathbb{P}_X \left( MSE_\xi \left( \hat{V}_{DC}|X \right) \geq MSE_\xi \left( \hat{V}_E|X \right) \right) \to 1. \]

The proof of Theorem 3 is provided in Appendix D.

### 4.3 Simulation evidence

We performed a simulation study to compare the performance of our estimator to the DC estimator under various scenarios. We consider three different data generating models for
the errors $\Xi = \{\xi_{ij}\}$: (i) independent and identically distributed errors, (ii) errors generated from the (exchangeable) bilinear mixed effects model of Hoff (2005) shown in (7) and (iii) errors generated from a non-exchangeable model. The non-exchangeable model included systematic noise in the upper-left quadrant of the relational error matrix $\Xi$. Since noise was added to actor relations in the same position in $\Xi$ in each simulation run, the distribution of the relations was not exchangeable: the distribution of the errors would be different for a reordering of the rows and columns.

For each simulation setting, we employed the following three-covariate regression model:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 1_{x_{2i} \in C} 1_{x_{2j} \in C} + \beta_3 |x_{3i} - x_{3j}| + \beta_4 x_{4ij} + \xi_{ij}. \quad (11)$$

In this model, $\beta_1$ is an intercept; $\beta_2$ is a coefficient on a binary indicator of whether individuals $i$ and $j$ both belong to a pre-specified class $C$; $\beta_3$ is a coefficient on the absolute difference of a continuous, actor-specific covariate $x_{3i}$; and $\beta_4$ is that for a pair-specific continuous covariate $x_{4ij}$. We note here that the matrix $X$ satisfies the jointly exchangeable assumption (B1) in Theorem 1. For the entirety of the study, we fixed $\beta$ at a single set of values. Since the variance of $\hat{\beta}$ explicitly depends on $X$, we generated 500 random design matrices $X$ for each sample size of actors, and for each design matrix simulated 1,000 error matrices under each of the three models to assess the variability of the standard error estimates and accuracy of the subsequent confidence intervals for $\beta$. For additional details on the simulation study procedure, see Appendix E.

Figures 3–5 display the coverage probabilities for 95% confidence intervals for each $\beta$ for the three error settings. Along with the dyadic clustering (DC) and exchangeable (EXCH) estimators, we also include the standard heteroskedasticity consistent (HC) estimator as a baseline, as in Aronow et al. (2015).

We draw two key conclusions from our simulations. First, our proposed approach performs extremely well compared to the DC and HC alternatives, even when the assumption
Figure 3: **(IID Errors)** Probability $\beta$ is in 95% confidence interval across 500 random X draws when the errors are independent and identically distributed. Lines in the boxplots denote the median coverage, the box denotes the middle 80% of coverages, and the whiskers denote the middle 95% of coverages across the set of design matrices.

Figure 4: **(Exchangeable Errors)** Probability $\beta$ is in 95% confidence interval across 500 random X draws when the errors are generated according to the exchangeable bilinear effects model. Lines in the boxplots denote the median coverage, the box denotes the middle 80% of coverages, and the whiskers denote the middle 95% of coverages across the set of design matrices.

of exchangeability of the errors is violated. Specifically, we see that the EXCH estimator produces confidence intervals with nominal, or near nominal, coverage for a variety of data generating processes. In addition, we see the variability in coverage across different X realizations for the EXCH estimator is substantially smaller than that for the other estimators. Intuitively the observed reduction in variability is a result of the averaging inherent in the
Figure 5: (Non-exchangeable Errors) Probability $\beta$ is in 95% confidence interval across 500 random $X$ draws when the errors are generated from a non-exchangeable network model. Lines in the boxplots denote the median coverage, the box denotes the middle 80% of coverages, and the whiskers denote the middle 95% of coverages across the set of design matrices.

EXCH estimator. In particular, the EXCH estimator replaces DC’s $O(n^3)$ unique residual products with five averages over subsets of these products. In Appendix E we plot the standard deviation of the EXCH and DC standard error estimates, where we clearly see the reduction in variability of the EXCH estimator relative to the DC estimator. We also plot the expected error (given $X$) of the DC and EXCH standard error estimates relative to the true standard errors. We find that both estimators generally underestimate the true standard errors (and thus confidence interval width), although the EXCH estimator underestimates to a significantly lesser degree. Returning to the coverage plots, it is interesting that even when the exchangeable assumption is incorrect, as in Figure 5, we see better performance from the EXCH estimator than the others. This is despite the fact that, in this heterogeneous case, we expect the empirical DC estimator to perform best. The performance of the EXCH estimator under non-exchangeable errors suggests that the reduction in the variability of the covariance entry estimates in the exchangeable estimator can outweigh the covariance model misspecification.

The second key observation we glean from the study is that the type of covariate (e.g. continuous actor-level characteristic versus product of binary indicators) affects the perfor-
mance of all standard error estimators. For example, Figures 4 and 5 show that when there is structure in the errors, the variability in the confidence interval coverage across design matrices is far greater for the binary covariate than for either of the continuous covariates. Focusing specifically on the boxes representing the middle 80% of coverage levels across the 500 simulations associated with the binary coefficient (left-most plots in Figures 3 through 5), we see the EXCH estimator coverage varies from about 93-98%, whereas the DC estimator varies between 50-95% with no improvement as the sample size \( n \) increases.

5 Regressions involving relational arrays

In this section we extend our discussion of exchangeable estimators to the case when \( R > 1 \). We introduce three notions of exchangeability for relational array data and discuss models consistent with these assumptions. We separately consider the cases when the underlying model for the error array is exchangeable along the third dimension and that when it is not. Figure 6 illustrates the former case and two variations of the latter. Before dissecting the spectrum of possible exchangeability assumptions, we first revisit the treatment of error arrays with \( R > 1 \) by Aronow et al. (2015).

5.1 Dyadic clustering

Aronow et al. (2015) examine relational regression standard errors when the third dimension, indexed by \( r \) in \( Y = \{ y^{(r)}_{ij} \} \), denotes time. Data consistent with this structure is, for example, country to country trade over time. Aronow et al. (2015)'s treatment is a direct extension of dyadic clustering in two dimensions: two errors \( \xi^{(r)}_{ij} \) and \( \xi^{(s)}_{k\ell} \) are assumed to be independent if the associated dyads do not share a member (i.e. \( \{i, j\} \cap \{k, \ell\} = \emptyset \)), regardless of the third dimension indices \( r \) and \( s \). As in the \( R = 1 \) case, each nonzero covariance entry is estimated by the corresponding residual product, i.e. \( \widehat{\text{Cov}} \left( \xi^{(r)}_{ij}, \xi^{(s)}_{k\ell} \right) = e^{(r)}_{ij} e^{(s)}_{k\ell} \). Note that this specification makes no assumptions about the dependence structure along the third
5.2 Exchangeability in the third dimension

Here we consider relational data that are fully exchangeable in the third dimension. Intu-
itively, the numbering of the row, column, and depth indices of an array with this property
are uninformative. For example, consider the case where the relational array $Y$ represents
the quantity of trade between pairs of countries, decomposed by various categories of goods
traded (e.g. intangible vs. tangible). Without reason to believe some pairs of good types
are more dependent than others, we might be willing to assume the dependence structure
along the third dimension is exchangeable.

Define a permutation of the third dimension indices $\nu(.)$ in addition to the row and
column permutation $\pi(.)$ defined previously. An array probability model that is jointly
exchangeable, as well as exchangeable in the third dimension, has the property that

$$
\text{Cov} \left( \xi^{(r)}_{ij}, \xi^{(s)}_{kl} \right) = \text{Cov} \left( \xi^{(\nu(r))}_{\pi(i)\pi(j)}, \xi^{(\nu(s))}_{\pi(k)\pi(l)} \right).
$$

(12)

It follows that the covariance matrix, denoted $\Omega_{Ea} = V[\Xi_v]$, consists of 10 distinct nonzero
parameters, corresponding to two submatrices $\Omega_1$ and $\Omega_2$, which each have exchangeable
structure as in Definition 1. Along the diagonal of $\Omega_{Ea}$ there are $R$ instances of the $n(n-1) \times n(n-1)$ matrix $\Omega_1$ represents covariance between observations that share the same third
index, i.e. $r = s$. The off-diagonal blocks of $\Omega_{Ea}$ are populated with a second $n(n-1) \times n(n-1)$ exchangeable error matrix $\Omega_2$ for errors that do not share the same third index, i.e.
$r \neq s$. This structure is depicted in Figure 6(a). As previously, we propose estimating each
of the 10 unique values with the average of the corresponding residual products.

Jointly exchangeable models that model the slices of the error array $\{\Xi^{(1)}, \Xi^{(2)}, ..., \Xi^{(R)}\}$
as independent constitute a subclass of the models with full exchangeability. Specifically,
they make the additional assumption that $\text{Cov} \left( \xi^{(r)}_{ij}, \xi^{(s)}_{kl} \right) = 0$ for $r \neq s$. In Figure 6(a), an
assumption of independence along the third dimension corresponds to $\Omega_2 = 0$.

Figure 6: Covariance matrices $\Omega = V[\Xi_v]$ for exchangeable arrays with depth $R = 4$ where $\Xi_v^T = \begin{pmatrix} (\Xi_v^{(1)})^T, (\Xi_v^{(2)})^T, (\Xi_v^{(3)})^T, (\Xi_v^{(4)})^T \end{pmatrix}$. All matrices are symmetric, where the $(i,j)$ block denotes $\text{Cov}(\Xi_v^{(i)}, \Xi_v^{(j)})$. Subfigure (a) corresponds to full exchangeability yielding two unique blocks, (b) corresponds to no exchangeability in the third dimension with stationarity assumption yielding $R = 4$ unique blocks, and (c) corresponds to no exchangeability in the third dimension yielding $(R^2) + R = 10$ unique blocks. Each block contains five unique nonzero terms as in $\Omega_E$ in Figure 2.

### 5.3 Partial exchangeability or no exchangeability in the third dimension

The assumption of exchangeability along the third dimension can be unnatural and inappropriate for certain data sets, so here we consider relaxing the fully exchangeable assumption introduced Section 5.2. Consider again the quantity of trade between countries $i$ and $j$ as the relational response, except where trade decomposed by time period rather than by good type. We would expect the temporal index in the third dimension to be non-exchangeable, as we might expect errors associated with nearby time periods will be more dependent than those far apart.

Here we consider arrays which are jointly exchangeable along the rows and columns only, such that the ordering of the array in the third (depth) dimension must remain the same for the probability distribution to remain invariant. Intuitively, this property corresponds to one where the labeling of rows and columns is inconsequential, but the labeling of the third
dimension is material. This exchangeability assumption implies

\[
\text{Cov}\left(\xi^{(r)}_{ij}, \xi^{(s)}_{k\ell}\right) = \text{Cov}\left(\xi^{(r)}_{\pi(i)\pi(j)}, \xi^{(s)}_{\pi(k)\pi(\ell)}\right).
\]

The full covariance matrix, denoted \(\Omega_{Ec} = V[\Xi_0]\), contains a separate \(n(n-1) \times n(n-1)\) exchangeable covariance matrix for each of the \(\binom{R}{2}\) unique third index pairings and each of the \(R\) diagonal variance matrices (see Figure 6(c)). Covariance matrices of this form contain \(5\binom{R}{2} + R\) unique parameters.

This type of exchangeability assumption is extremely unrestrictive. Specifically, it places no constraints on the evolution of the dependence along the third dimension. However, a more restrictive assumption specifying the relationships among the covariances in the third dimension may be appropriate when we expect the behavior in this dimension to vary in a particular manner. For example, if the third dimension corresponds to different time periods, it may be reasonable to assume stationarity along the third dimension, whereby the covariance across time periods only depends on the absolute difference in the time indices. In this case, there are five unique nonzero covariances for each difference in time \(|r - s|\), yielding \(5R\) unique nonzero values in the covariance matrix. We denote a covariance matrix with this structure by \(\Omega_{Eb}\) (see Figure 6(b)).

6 Patterns in international trade

In this section we demonstrate our exchangeable standard error estimator using data on international trade flow over multiple decades. We fit the model using Generalized Estimating Equations (GEE), which weights the estimating equations, \(g\), in (3) by an estimate of the inverse of the “working” covariance matrix of the observations (see, for example, Chapter 8 in Wakefield (2013) for a review of GEE). When the assumed covariance structure is correct, this approach yields an estimator \(\hat{\beta}\) which has improved efficiency over that based on unweighted equations in (3). In the remainder of this section, we outline how the exchange-
able estimator can be used in a method of moments (weighted least squares) approach to estimation and present results from the international trade data.

6.1 Inference via GEE

Inference via GEE proceeds by first specifying a “working” covariance matrix for the errors, which serves as a weight for estimating equations. The choice of the working covariance matrix represents a trade-off between robustness and efficiency. If the working matrix resembles the true underlying covariance structure, then the efficiency of \( \hat{\beta} \) improves over that resulting from the estimating equations in (3). Even if the working covariance is misspecified, the standard error estimates for \( \hat{\beta} \) can be ‘corrected’ using the sandwich standard error estimators with an appropriate estimator \( \hat{\Omega} \). However, these standard error estimates can be unstable if the assumed working structure differs greatly from the truth, which, of course, is unknown in practice (see discussion in Chapter 8 of Wakefield (2013), for example).

The GEE algorithm proceeds as follows. Let \( W^{-1} \) be the working covariance matrix, then the estimate of \( \beta \) is the solution to the GEE estimating equation

\[
XW(Y_v - \beta^TX) = 0,
\]

and the corresponding variance estimator of the coefficients is

\[
V[\hat{\beta}] = (X^TWX)^{-1}X^TW\Omega WX(X^TWX)^{-1}.
\]

Our estimation algorithm is composed of a two-step iteration procedure. Given initial estimates \( \hat{\beta}^{(0)} \) and corresponding residuals \( \hat{\Xi}^{(0)} \), we iterate between two steps, such that for iteration \( \tau + 1 \):

1. Solving \( X\hat{W}^{(\tau)}(Y_v - X\hat{\beta}^{(\tau+1)}) = 0 \), set \( \hat{\beta}^{(\tau+1)} = \left(X^T\hat{W}^{(\tau)}X\right)^{-1}X^T\hat{W}^{(\tau)}Y_v \).
2. Use \( \hat{\beta}^{(\tau+1)} \) to calculate \( \hat{\Xi}^{(\tau+1)} \), and obtain estimates \( \hat{\Omega}^{(\tau+1)} \) and \( \hat{W}^{(\tau+1)} \).
These steps are repeated until convergence.

### 6.2 International trade models

We demonstrate the implications of using our exchangeable standard error estimator in a study of international trade between 58 countries. These data were previously analyzed and made available by [Westveld and Hoff (2011)](#). For each pair of countries, we observe yearly total volume of trade between the two countries for a period from 1981-2000. Following [Westveld and Hoff (2011)](#) and [Tinbergen (1962)](#), we model (log) trade in a given year using a modified gravity mean model. The gravity model, proposed by [Tinbergen (1962)](#), posits that the total trade between countries is proportional to overall economic activity of the countries weighted by the inverse of the distance between them (raised to a power). Following [Ward and Hoff (2007)](#) we also add an indicator for whether the nations’ militaries cooperated in the given year and a measure of democracy, i.e. polity, which ranges from 0 (highly authoritarian) to 20 (highly democratic).

The complete model has the form:

\[
\ln \text{Trade}_{ijt} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln \text{GDP}_{it} + \beta_2 \ln \text{GDP}_{jt} + \beta_3 \ln D_{ijt} + \beta_4 \ln D_{ijt} + \beta_5 \ln \text{GDP}_{it} + \beta_6 \ln \text{GDP}_{jt} + \beta_7 (\text{Pol}_{it} \times \text{Pol}_{jt}) + \epsilon_{ijt},
\]

where \(\ln \text{Trade}_{ijt}\) is the (log) volume of trade between countries \(i\) and \(j\) at time \(t\); \(\ln \text{GDP}_{it}\) and \(\ln \text{GDP}_{jt}\) are the (log) Gross Domestic Product of nations \(i\) and \(j\), respectively; \(\ln D_{ijt}\) is the (log) geographic distance between nations; \(\text{CC}_{ijt}\) is the measure of cooperation in conflict (coded as +1 if nations were on the same side of a dispute and -1 if they were on opposing sides); and \(\text{Pol}_{it}\) and \(\text{Pol}_{jt}\) are the polity measures for \(i\) and \(j\), respectively.

We fit the regression model above using the GEE approach, where both the working covariance matrix \(W^{-1}\) and the population covariance matrix \(\Omega\) have the covariance structure

---

1 See [https://doi.org/10.1214/10-AOS403SUPP](https://doi.org/10.1214/10-AOS403SUPP) for data.
Ω_{Ea}, as in panel (a) of Figure 6. The estimator of β is then based the assumption that the error covariance structure is fully exchangeable. We place no further restrictions on the covariance structure beyond this exchangeability.

The exchangeability assumption underlying our approach differs substantially from assumptions frequently made in analyses of temporal relational data. For example, Westveld and Hoff (2011) explicitly decompose the error term for each pair and time, ϵ_{ijt}, into time-dependent sender and receiver effects, which represent relational structure, and a temporally dependent autoregressive order-one error term. The error structure in Figure 6(a), in contrast, imposes an exchangeability restriction and a temporal structure that implies the covariance is the same across overlapping dyads in different time points. We expect the typical trade-off between modeling assumptions and efficiency to apply: Westveld and Hoff (2011) estimates will be more efficient if the assumed model structure is correct.

We compare our results to those from Westveld and Hoff (2011), as well as to the DC estimator of Aronow et al. (2015) described in Section 5.1. Recall the DC estimator makes even fewer assumptions about the structure of the error dependence than our method, but it cannot be used for GEE because the covariance matrix estimator \hat{Ω}_{DC} is always singular. Thus, in the following comparison with the DC estimator, we use ordinary least squares to estimate β as in (3) and estimate confidence intervals using \hat{V}_{DC}. In Appendix F, we provide a proof that \hat{Ω}_{DC} is always singular and we provide a method for efficiently inverting \hat{Ω}_{E} in Appendix G.

### 6.3 International trade results

The estimated coefficients and corresponding 95% confidence intervals and posterior credible intervals are shown in Figure 7. Coefficient estimates for Westveld and Hoff (2011) are posterior medians and 95% credible intervals based on a Bayesian estimation procedure. Interpreting Figure 7 requires care as (i) there is no ground truth and (ii) we are comparing three different inference paradigms. Nonetheless, focusing on two aspects of Figure 7 reveals
Figure 7: Estimated coefficients for the all time periods using three different estimation techniques.
important insights for practitioners determining which paradigm to use. First, consider the overall trends in estimated $\hat{\beta}$ across time for the three methods. Fitting using GEE produces coefficients much closer to Westveld and Hoff (2011) than OLS. In particular, the intercept estimated via OLS is approximately three times larger in magnitude than either Westveld and Hoff (2011) or our GEE estimates. We see a similar result with the other coefficient that is relatively constant over time, log GDP of exporter. Both the GEE and the OLS estimates roughly match the temporal trends of the Westveld and Hoff (2011) estimates, with the exception of the cooperation in conflict variable. For this case, the Westveld and Hoff (2011) and GEE estimators are both nearly zero from 1990 onward. The OLS estimator, however, demonstrates substantial fluctuations that are not present in the other methods.

The second aspect to take note of is confidence interval width. The widths of the confidence intervals for the exchangeable GEE approach are generally comparable to Westveld and Hoff (2011), while the DC interval widths are noticeably larger. The exchangeable GEE approach incorporates information about the covariance structure of the errors when estimating the regression coefficients. The OLS estimate of $\beta$, however, is identical to a GEE estimate when the working covariance $W^{-1} = I$. If the working covariance estimate is close to the (unknown) true covariance we expect efficiency gains in the GEE estimate of $\beta$ over the OLS estimate. The widths of the Westveld and Hoff (2011) and GEE intervals also tend to be more consistent across time periods than those from OLS/DC. For the cooperation in conflict variable, for example, the OLS/DC confidence intervals become markedly wider during the upward spikes, one of which, in the late 1980s, is only present in OLS/DC estimate.

7 Discussion and conclusion

This paper develops a new set of uncertainty estimators for regression models on relational arrays. The proposed estimators strike a balance between making additional assumptions to
decrease variability and remaining robust to dependence heterogeneity and model misspecification. We show that the proposed estimators are consistent and, when the error structure is exchangeable, that the mean-square error is less than that of the state of the art estimator with probability approaching one. In simulation studies, our proposed estimators achieve better coverage than currently available methods, even when the underlying generative model violates the assumptions. Lastly, we demonstrate that our covariance matrix estimator can be used to weight coefficient estimates in GEE in an analysis of data on international trade flows.

Our estimator is not appropriate when the dependence among relations, i.e. the covariance structure, is extremely heterogeneous. This can happen in two ways: (i) heterogeneity in the covariance structure is endogenous with an observed covariate that is not included in the regression (a variant of omitted variable bias) and (ii) there is heterogeneity in the error variances even after accounting for all observables in the “true” generating model. In both cases, we could consider an extension of our approach that would further compromise between the unstructured covariance structure of the DC estimator and our exchangeable covariance structure. One could, for example, use a two-stage approach that first estimates actor clusters using the residuals, then assumes exchangeability within but not across clusters.

Many relational data sets contain binary or count measures, such as the presence or absence of relations between actors or number of interactions. Estimating equation and GEE procedures are often used with non-continuous data whereby the $g$ equations in (2) involve a link function connecting the observed relation to the covariates, mirroring generalized linear regression procedures. While it is possible to impose an exchangeability assumption on the covariance matrix of the observations with non-continuous data, it is unclear how the assumption translates to an assumption about the data generating process. For example, consider the logit and probit regression models for binary data. Both models possess latent variable constructions which involve thresholding a latent continuous outcome composed of
the linear regression function plus a random error. Exchangeability of these errors does not imply the relations themselves are exchangeable (conditional on the covariates) as the covariates impact the dependence structure among the relational measures. For this reason, the methods proposed here cannot be trivially applied to non-continuous relational data. This is a current area of research for the authors.
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Online Supplement

A Undirected arrays

This section specializes the results presented in the manuscript to undirected relational data. Consider the case when \( R = 1 \) and suppose the relational data contains the relations among \( n \) actors. The covariance of the errors \( \Omega \) contains three unique elements

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ij}) := \theta, & \quad \text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{ki}) := \phi, & \quad \text{Cov}(\xi_{ij}, \xi_{kl}) := 0.
\end{align*}
\]

As in the directed case, we assume the last covariance, corresponding to two relations which share no common member, is zero. We again estimate the two remaining terms using the residual matrix \( E = \{e_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \). Note that the residual matrix we consider is for the entire \( n \times n \) matrix of relations and thus contains duplicate off-diagonal entries corresponding to pairs \( \{(i, j), (j, i)\} \). We set the diagonal of \( E \) to zero as the relation between an actor and itself is undefined.

The estimate of \( \theta \) is the empirical mean of each squared residual and can be expressed

\[
\hat{\theta} = \frac{\text{tr}(EE)}{n(n-1)}
\]

where \( \text{tr}(\cdot) \) denotes the matrix trace operator.

Similarly, the estimate of \( \phi \) is

\[
\hat{\phi} = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} e_{ij} \left( \sum_{k \neq i} e_{ik} + \sum_{k \neq j} e_{kj} - 2e_{ij} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{m} 1^T (EE) 1 - \text{tr}(EE) \quad \text{where} \quad m = n(n - 1)(n - 2).
\]
B Proof of asymptotic normality of $\hat{\beta}$

For this proof, and throughout the online supplement, we adopt slightly different notation to simplify the representation of the exchangeable covariance estimator. Recall that the exchangeable covariance estimator for the OLS estimating equations is

$$\hat{V}_E = (X^T X)^{-1} X^T \hat{\Omega}_E X (X^T X)^{-1},$$

where $\hat{\Omega}_E$ is the exchangeable estimate of the error covariance matrix, consisting of five averages of residual products. Here we express $\hat{\Omega}_E$ as

$$\hat{\Omega}_E = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \hat{\phi}_i S_i,$$

where $\hat{\phi}_i = \frac{\sum_{(jk,\ell m) \in \Theta_i} e_{jk} e_{\ell m}}{|\Theta_i|}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. (14)

This amounts to mapping $\sigma^2 \mapsto \phi_1$, $\phi_a \mapsto \phi_2$, ..., $\phi_d \mapsto \phi_5$, and re-indexing the $S$ and $M$ matrices accordingly. Additionally, when we consider sequences of jointly exchangeable random variables $\{W_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^{n}$, it is understood that the sequence arises from a relational array such that entries with $i = j$ are undefined. Thus, sums over the sequence are of $n(n-1)$ terms and we define $\sum_{ij} W_{ij} = \sum_{i \neq j} W_{ij}$.

We work in the asymptotic regime where actors are added incrementally to the relational data set, i.e. $n$ is continually increasing. To establish asymptotic normality of $\hat{\beta}$, we wish to show

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \rightarrow_d N(0, M_1^{-1}(\phi_3 M_3 + \phi_4 M_4 + 2\phi_5 M_5) M_1^{-1}),$$

where $\{M_i\}_{i \in \{1, 3, 4, 5\}}$ are as in \cite{8} and $\rightarrow_d$ denotes element-wise convergence in distribution.

The motivation for the proof argument follows from the expression

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) = \left( \frac{\sum_{jk} x_{jk} x_{jk}^T}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1} \sqrt{n} \frac{\sum_{jk} x_{jk} \xi_{jk}}{n(n-1)}.$$

(16)
We note that \( \left( \frac{\sum_{jk} x_{jk} x_{jk}}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1} \) converges in probability to \( M_1^{-1} \) and then show asymptotic normality of the second multiplicative term in (16).

To analyze \( \{x_{ij} \xi_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n \), we note that, by condition (B1), the joint exchangeability and independence of non-overlapping pairs of the sequence \( \{\xi_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n \) extends to the component sequences in the vectors \( \{x_{ij} \xi_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n \). Thus, to prove asymptotic normality of \( \widehat{\beta} \), we first prove a theorem stating that the average of a mean-zero sequence of jointly exchangeable random variables is asymptotically normal. Specifically, for \( \{W_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n \) mean zero and jointly exchangeable, we show

\[
\frac{k_n \sum_{ij} W_{ij}}{\sigma} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1) \quad (17)
\]

for some normalizing constant \( \sigma \) and fixed sequence \( k_n \rightarrow 0 \) as \( n \rightarrow \infty \).

To prove (17), we rely on a result from Bolthausen (1982), as well as a supporting lemma which we present here. Below we outline the significance of these results in the proof.

- **Lemma 1** (Bolthausen (1982)): Provides a sufficient condition for asymptotic normality of a sequence of measures based on the standard normal characteristic function.

- **Lemma 2**: Provides a bound for a variance that surfaces in the proof of asymptotic normality in (17).

From (17), we immediately have the marginal asymptotic normality of the sample mean of each of the vector components in the sequence \( \{x_{ij} \xi_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n \). To establish joint asymptotic normality, we employ the Cramér-Wold (1936) device, where asymptotic normality of \( \{v^T x_{ij} \xi_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n \), for all \( v \in \mathbb{R}^p \) with \( ||v|| = 1 \), establishes joint normality. To achieve the asymptotic normality of this inner product, we simply recognize that this inner product is itself the mean of an exchangeable sequence of random variables. Joint asymptotic normality of the mean of the sequence of vectors \( \{x_{ij} \xi_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n \) establishes joint asymptotic normality of \( \widehat{\beta} \) via (16).
B.1 Lemmas and theorem in support of Theorem 1

The following is Lemma 2 in Bolthausen (1982) and provides a sufficient condition for asymptotic normality. We abuse notation slightly, letting $i$ be the imaginary unit where appropriate.

**Lemma 1** (Bolthausen (1982)). Let $\nu_n$ be a sequence of probability distributions over $\mathbb{R}$ which satisfies

1. $\sup_n \int x^2 d\nu_n(x) < \infty$, and

2. for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lim_n \int (i\lambda - x)e^{i\lambda x}d\nu_n(x) = 0$.

Then, $\nu_n \rightarrow_d N(0,1)$.

To provide intuition for Lemma 1, the integral in condition (2) is identically zero when $\nu_n$ is the standard normal distribution.

The next lemma provides a sufficient condition on the dependence structure in $\{W_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n$ necessary for the proof of asymptotic normality in (17). Again we emphasize that terms in $\{W_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n$ with $i = j$ are undefined.

**Lemma 2.** Let $\{W_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n$ be a sequence of jointly exchangeable random variables as in Definition 1 with $\|W_{ij}\|_4 < L < \infty$, where $\|W_{ij}\|_p := \mathbb{E}[|W_{ij}|^p]^{1/p}$ for $p > 0$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{n^6}V \left[ \sum_{ij} \sum_{kl \in \Theta_{ij}} W_{ij}W_{kl} \right] < \frac{CL^4}{n} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

(18)

for some $C < \infty$, where $\Theta_{ij}$ is the set of ordered pairs $(k,l)$ that share an index with $(i,j)$.

**Proof.** By definition we write

$$\frac{1}{n^6}V \left[ \sum_{ij} \sum_{kl \in \Theta_{ij}} W_{ij}W_{kl} \right] = \frac{1}{n^6} \sum_{ij} \sum_{kl \in \Theta_{ij}} \sum_{rs} \sum_{tu \in \Theta_{rs}} \text{Cov}(W_{ij}W_{kl}, W_{rs}W_{tu}).$$

(19)
Each covariance of (19) is bounded by $L^4$. To bound the variance, we will show the number of nonzero entries in the sum is $O(n^5)$. For $\text{Cov}(W_{ij}W_{kl}, W_{rs}W_{tu}) \neq 0$, there must be overlap between the index sets $\{i, j, k, l\}$ and $\{r, s, t, u\}$. Further, the sum in (19) is taken over index sets that themselves contain overlap, i.e. $\{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset$ and $\{r, s\} \cap \{t, u\} \neq \emptyset$. For example, the index sets $\{i, j, i, l\}$ and $\{i, s, i, u\}$ have nonzero covariance in (19). Since there are 5 unique indices in the union of the sets $\{i, j, i, l\}$ and $\{i, s, i, u\}$, there are $O(n^5)$ such index set pairs of this form in total. There are 96 pairs of index sets that result in nonzero covariance $\text{Cov}(W_{ij}W_{kl}, W_{rs}W_{tu})$. For example, another such pair of index sets is $\{i, j, i, l\}$ and $\{i, j, i, j\}$. Each of these 96 pairs of index sets is $O(n^5)$. Thus, the sum of covariances in (19) is over $O(n^5)$ bounded elements.

It is worth noting that we repeat the counting argument in the proof of Lemma 2 in many of the following proofs, including those in later appendices. Now that we have Lemma 1 and 2, we prove that a general sequence of mean-zero exchangeable random variables is asymptotically normal.

**Theorem 4.** Let $\{W_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n$ be a mean-zero sequence of jointly exchangeable random variables with at least one of $\{\phi_3, \phi_4, \phi_5\}$ nonzero. If $||W_{ij}||_4 < L < \infty$, then

$$\sqrt{n} \sum_{ij} W_{ij} n(n-1) \to_d N(0, \phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5) \text{ as } n \to \infty. \quad (20)$$

**Proof.** We first show that $\phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5$ is the correct limiting variance. Writing the variance of the expression on the left hand side of (20) explicitly and recalling that entries such that $i = j$ are undefined, we see

$$V\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{n(n-1)} \sum_{ij} W_{ij}\right) = \frac{n}{n^2(n-1)^2} \sum_{ij} \sum_{kl \in \Theta_{ij}} \text{Cov}(W_{ij}, W_{kl}) \quad (21)$$

$$= \frac{n}{n^2(n-1)^2} \left( n(n-1)(\phi_1 + \phi_2) + n(n-1)(n-2)(\phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5) \right)$$

$$\to \phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5 \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$
by the properties of joint exchangeability of \( \{W_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n \) as described in Section 3.3. This variance is finite and nonzero by assumption. To prove (20), it is sufficient to show

\[
\bar{S}_n := \frac{\sum_{ij} W_{ij}}{n^{3/2} \sqrt{\phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5}} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1).
\] (22)

Define the limiting variance as \( \sigma_n^2 = n^3(\phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5) \) and the sum \( S_n = \sum_{ij} W_{ij} \).

To establish (22), we employ Lemma 1, where \( \nu_n \) is the probability measure corresponding to \( \bar{S}_n \) for all \( n \). The first condition of Lemma 1 is satisfied since

\[
E[(\bar{S}_n)^2] = \frac{V[\sum_{ij} W_{ij}]}{n^3(\phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5)} < CL^2
\] (23)

for \( C < \infty \) and all \( n \). Thus, to prove (22), it is sufficient to show the second condition of Lemma 1 for all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
E \left[ (i\lambda - \bar{S}_n)e^{i\lambda \bar{S}_n} \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty.
\] (24)

We decompose the term in the expectation as in Guyon and Ludena (1995) and Lumley and Hamblett (2003):

\[
(i\lambda - \bar{S}_n)e^{i\lambda \bar{S}_n} = A_1 - A_2 - A_3,
\] (25)

where

\[
A_1 = i\lambda e^{i\lambda \bar{S}_n} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2} \sum_{ij} W_{ij} S_{ij,n} \right), \quad A_3 = \frac{1}{\sigma_n} \sum_{ij} W_{ij} e^{i\lambda (\bar{S}_n - \bar{S}_{ij,n})},
\]

\[
A_2 = \frac{e^{i\lambda \bar{S}_n}}{\sigma_n} \sum_{ij} W_{ij} \left( 1 - i\lambda \bar{S}_{ij,n} - e^{-i\lambda \bar{S}_{ij,n}} \right), \quad S_{ij,n} = \sum_{kl \in \Theta_{ij}} W_{kl}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{S}_{ij,n} = S_{ij,n}/\sigma_n.
\]

To satisfy (24) it remains to be shown that \( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[A_m] = 0 \) for each \( m \in \{1, 2, 3\} \).
A\textsubscript{1} : First notice that \(|e^{i\lambda S_n}| \leq 1\). Using this fact and Lemma \ref{lemma2},

\[
0 \leq \mathbb{E}[|A_1|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[|A_1|^2] \leq \lambda^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| 1 - \frac{1}{\sigma^2_n} \sum_{ij} W_{ij} S_{ij,n} \right|^2 \right] \leq \lambda^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{ij} W_{ij} \right]^2 + \lambda^2 \left( 1 - \frac{\sum_{ij} W_{ij}}{\sigma^2_n} \right)^2 \leq \lambda^2 \left( \frac{CL^4}{n} + \frac{O(n^{-2})}{\sigma^2_n} \right) \to 0
\]

for all real \(\lambda\). \(\mathbb{E}[|A_1|^2]\) limiting to zero implies \(\mathbb{E}[|A_1|]\) limits to zero, and hence \(\mathbb{E}[A_1]\) limits to zero.

A\textsubscript{2} : By Taylor expansion of \(e^{-i\lambda \bar{S}_{ij,n}}\), we can write

\[
\left| 1 - i\lambda \bar{S}_{ij,n} - e^{-i\lambda \bar{S}_{ij,n}} \right| \leq c\lambda^2 (\bar{S}_{ij,n})^2,
\]

for some \(0 < c < \infty\) and all \(n, \lambda\). Using this bound and the fact that \(|\Theta_{ij}| = 4n - 6\), we evaluate \(\mathbb{E}[|A_2|]\) directly below:

\[
\mathbb{E}[|A_2|] \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_n} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{ij} |W_{ij}| \left| 1 - i\lambda \bar{S}_{ij,n} - e^{-i\lambda \bar{S}_{ij,n}} \right| \right],
\]

\[
\leq \frac{c\lambda^2}{\sigma^3_n} \sum_{ij} \mathbb{E} \left[ |W_{ij}| (S_{ij,n})^2 \right],
\]

\[
\leq \frac{c\lambda^2}{\sigma^3_n} n(n-1)(4n-6)^2 L^3 \to 0,
\]

for all real \(\lambda\). As \(\mathbb{E}[|A_2|]\) limits to zero, so does \(\mathbb{E}[A_2]\).

A\textsubscript{3} : Note that \(S_{ij,n}\) sums all terms in the sequence \(\{W_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^n\) that depend upon \(W_{ij}\),
including \( W_{ij} \) itself. Thus, \( W_{ij} \) and \( \bar{S}_n - \bar{S}_{ij,n} \) are independent. It follows immediately that

\[
E \left[ \frac{1}{\sigma_n} \sum_{ij} W_{ij} e^{i\lambda(\bar{S}_n - \bar{S}_{ij,n})} \right] = \frac{1}{\sigma_n} \sum_{ij} E[W_{ij}] E[e^{i\lambda(\bar{S}_n - \bar{S}_{ij,n})}] = 0,
\]

since \( E[W_{ij}] = 0 \) for all ordered pairs \((i, j)\).

Hence, \( \lim_{n \to \infty} E[A_m] = 0 \) for each \( m \in \{1, 2, 3\} \) and we have the convergence in \([24]\), implying \( \bar{S}_n \to_d N(0, 1) \) by Lemma [1] which gives the desired result in \([20]\). \(
\)

**B.2 Proof of Theorem 1**

We begin by writing

\[
\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta) = \left( \frac{\sum_{jk} x_{jk} x_{jk}^T}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1} \sqrt{n} \sum_{jk} x_{jk} \xi_{jk},
\]

again emphasizing that entries in the sum with \( j = k \) are undefined and omitted. Addressing

the first multiplicative term in \([35]\), we recall that the inverse map is continuous. Then, by

\([8]\) and the continuous mapping theorem, we have

\[
\left( \frac{\sum_{jk} x_{jk} x_{jk}^T}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1} \to_p M_1^{-1}.
\]

We now analyze the second multiplicative term in \([35]\). Showing asymptotic normality

of this term is sufficient to show asymptotic normality of the expression on the left hand side

of \([35]\). Recall \( x_{jk}^T = [x_{jk}^{(1)}, x_{jk}^{(2)}, \ldots, x_{jk}^{(p)}]. \) We wish to show that the sum of vectors

\[
U_n := \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n(n-1)} \sum_{jk} x_{jk} \xi_{jk} \to_d N(0, \Sigma),
\]

for some limiting variance \( \Sigma \). By the Cramér-Wold device \([\text{Cramér and Wold}, 1936]\), \( U_n \)
is asymptotically normal with asymptotic variance \( \Sigma \) if and only if \( v^T U_n \) is asymptotically
normal with asymptotic variance $v^T \Sigma v$ for every vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $||v|| = 1$. Clearly,

$$v^T U_n := \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n(n-1)} \sum_{jk} \tilde{x}_{jk} \xi_{jk},$$

where we define $\tilde{x}_{jk} = v^T x_{jk}$. We wish to apply Theorem 4 to the sequence $\{\tilde{x}_{jk} \xi_{jk}\}_{j,k=1}^n$. First, the condition of finite moments in (B2) of Theorem 1 and $||v|| = 1$ implies that $||\tilde{x}_{jk} \xi_{jk}||_4 < L$ for some finite $L < \infty$. Secondly, by the independence of $X$ and $\Xi$ in (B3) of Theorem 1, the sequence $\{\tilde{x}_{jk} \xi_{jk}\}_{j,k=1}^n$ is a mean-zero exchangeable sequence of scalar random variables. Taking the variance directly, we have

$$V \left[ \sum_{jk} \tilde{x}_{jk} \xi_{jk} \right] = n^3 v^T (\phi_1 M_1 O(n^{-1}) + \phi_2 M_2 O(n^{-1}) + \phi_3 M_3 + \phi_4 M_4 + 2\phi_5 M_5) v. \quad (39)$$

Then, we apply Theorem 4 with $\sigma^2_n = V[\sum_{jk} \tilde{x}_{jk} \xi_{jk}]$ from (39), which gives that

$$v^T U_n \rightarrow_d N(0, v^T (\phi_3 M_3 + \phi_4 M_4 + 2\phi_5 M_5) v). \quad (40)$$

Thus, by the Cramér-Wold device, we get the desired joint asymptotic normality

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} \sum_{jk} x_{jk} \xi_{jk}}{n(n-1)} \rightarrow_d N(0, \phi_3 M_3 + \phi_4 M_4 + 2\phi_5 M_5). \quad (41)$$

Combining the convergence in probability in (36) and the asymptotic normality of (41), we obtain the desired result.

C Proof of consistency of $\hat{V}_E$

For this proof, we adopt the same change in notation as in Appendix B defined in (14). We deviate slightly in that we denote $\Theta_i$ to denote dyadic pairs $(j,k)$ and $(l,m)$ that share a member in the $i^{th}$ manner. For example, for $i = 3$ we must have $j = l$ and $m \neq k$. We use
the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.

This proof is outlined as follows. We initially prove that the exchangeable estimator \( \hat{V}_E \) is consistent if the exchangeable parameter estimates \( \{ \hat{\phi}_i : i = 1, \ldots, 5 \} \) are consistent for the true parameters. We then prove consistency of \( \{ \hat{\phi}_i \} \) in two steps: (a) we show parameter estimates \( \{ \tilde{\phi}_i \} \) based on the unobserved true errors \( \Xi \) are consistent and then (b) we show that the parameter estimates \( \{ \hat{\phi}_i \} \) are asymptotically equivalent to \( \{ \tilde{\phi}_i \} \). We require the consistency of \( \hat{\beta} \) result (implied by Theorem 1) for this last step.

C.1 Proof of Theorem 2

We first note that from Theorem 1 the order of convergence of \( \hat{\beta} \) is \( \sqrt{n} \). Thus, we choose the rate \( n \) as our asymptotic regime for consistency of \( \hat{V}_E \). We wish to show that

\[
n\hat{V}_E - nV[\beta] \rightarrow_p 0.
\]

(42)

1. Sufficient to show consistency of \( \{ \hat{\phi}_i \} \)

Here we show that to prove consistency of \( \hat{V}_E \), it is sufficient to prove the consistency of the parameter estimates \( \{ \hat{\phi}_i \} \) for the true parameters. We begin by writing the difference of variances in (42) as

\[
n\hat{V}_E - nV[\beta] = n(X^T X)^{-1}X^T (\hat{\Omega}_E - \Omega_E) X (X^T X)^{-1}
\]

\[
= \frac{n}{n^2(n-1)^2} \left( \frac{X^T X}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{X^T \sum_{i=1}^5 |\Theta_i| (\hat{\phi}_i - \phi_i) S_i X}{|\Theta_i|} \right) \left( \frac{X^T X}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1}
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^5 \frac{|\Theta_i|}{n(n-1)^2} (\hat{\phi}_i - \phi_i) \left( \frac{X^T X}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\sum_{jk,\ell m} \in \Theta_i X_{jk} X_{\ell m}^T}{|\Theta_i|} \right) \left( \frac{X^T X}{n(n-1)} \right)^{-1}
\]

\[
: = \sum_{i=1}^5 c_{i,n} (\hat{\phi}_i - \phi_i) h_{i,n}(X),
\]

(43)

where \( c_{i,n} = |\Theta_i|/n(n-1)^2 \) and \( h_{i,n}(X) \) contains the remaining terms which are functions of \( X \). By the counting argument used to show Lemma 2, each \( |\Theta_i| \) is at most \( O(n^2) \), so each...
$c_{i,n} \to d_i$ for some finite constant $d_i$, namely $d_i = 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $d_i = 1$ when $i \in \{3, 4\}$, and $d_i = 2$ for $i = 5$. To obtain the result in (42), it is sufficient then to show $\hat{\phi}_i - \phi_i \to_p 0$ and $h_{i,n}(X)$ converges in probability to some constant for all $i$. The latter comes easily, that is, by assumption and Slutsky’s theorem,

$$h_{i,n}(X) \to_p M_i^{-1}M_iM_i^{-1}, \ i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}. \quad (44)$$

The continuous mapping theorem allows us to take the probability limit of $\frac{X^TX}{n(n-1)}$ before inversion, as the inversion map is continuous.

We now consider consistency of the parameter estimates $\hat{\phi}_i$. First, define error averages $\{\tilde{\phi}_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ analogous to the parameter estimates, such that for each $i$

$$\tilde{\phi}_i = \frac{1}{|\Theta_i|} \sum_{(jk, \ell m) \in \Theta_i} \xi_{jk} \xi_{\ell m}. \quad (45)$$

We will show $\tilde{\phi}_i - \phi_i$ converges in probability to zero, and then do the same for $\hat{\phi}_i - \tilde{\phi}_i$. This is sufficient for showing $\hat{\phi}_i - \phi_i \to_p 0$ as $\hat{\phi}_i - \phi_i = (\hat{\phi}_i - \tilde{\phi}_i) + (\tilde{\phi}_i - \phi_i)$.

2. Consistency of $\tilde{\phi}_i$ for $\phi_i$

To show convergence in probability of $\tilde{\phi}_i - \phi_i$ to zero, we use the argument that the bias and variance both tend to zero. By assumption (A1), $E[\xi_{jk} \xi_{\ell m}] = \phi_i$ for every relation pair $(jk, \ell m) \in \Theta_i$. Thus, $E[\tilde{\phi}_i - \phi_i] = 0$ for all $n$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$. We now turn to the variance:

$$V[\tilde{\phi}_i] = \frac{1}{|\Theta_i|^2} \sum_{(jk, \ell m) \in \Theta_i} \sum_{(rs, tu) \in \Theta_i} \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk} \xi_{\ell m}, \xi_{rs} \xi_{tu}). \quad (46)$$

We again make a counting argument similar to that in Lemma [2]. By condition (B2), each of the $|\Theta_i|^2$ covariances in the sum above are bounded. The covariance between $\xi_{jk} \xi_{\ell m}$ and $\xi_{rs} \xi_{ts}$ is nonzero only if there is overlap between their two index sets. This reduces the number of nonzero covariances from the maximum possible $|\Theta_i|^2$ by a factor of at least $n$.\text{\hfill}\Box
Again, consider the case of $i = 3$ where $|\Theta_3| = \mathcal{O}(n^3)$. Each pair of relations in $\Theta_3$ must be of the form $(jk,jm)$, and thus the second set of indices must be of the form $(js,ju)$, for example, for the covariance to be nonzero. The set of indices $\{j,k,j,m,j,s,j,u\}$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(n^5) = |\Theta_3|^2 n^{-1}$. There are other forms of relation pairs in the second sum that give rise to nonzero covariance, such as $(ks,ku)$ and so on. However, there are nine such forms, each of which is $\mathcal{O}(n^5)$. Thus, the number of nonzero covariances is $\mathcal{O}(n^5)$, and hence, we have

$$V[\tilde{\phi}_i] = \frac{|\Theta_i|^2 \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})}{|\Theta_i|^2} \rightarrow 0.$$ (47)

This same argument holds for all $i$, and thus, we have the desired consistency: $\tilde{\phi}_i - \phi_i \rightarrow_p 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 5$.

3. Asymptotic equivalence of $\hat{\phi}_i$ and $\tilde{\phi}_i$

We now show that $\hat{\phi}_i - \tilde{\phi}_i$ converges in probability to zero. We first write the expression in terms of the estimated coefficients $\hat{\beta}$:

$$\hat{\phi}_i - \tilde{\phi}_i = \sum_{(jk,\ell m) \in \Theta_i} \frac{e_{jk}e_{\ell m} - \xi_{jk}\xi_{\ell m}}{|\Theta_i|} \rightarrow_p 0,$$

where

$$\hat{\phi}_i = \frac{1}{|\Theta_i|} \sum_{(jk,\ell m) \in \Theta_i} \left( (\beta - \beta)^T (x_{jk} x_{\ell m}^T) (\beta - \beta) - (\beta - \beta)^T (\xi_{jk} x_{\ell m} + \xi_{\ell m} x_{jk}) \right).$$ (48)

By Theorem 1, $\hat{\beta} - \beta$ converges to zero in probability. By Slutsky’s theorem, if the terms in (48) involving elements of $X$ and $\Xi$ converge in probability to any constant, then $\hat{\phi}_i - \tilde{\phi}_i$ converges in probability to zero. By (B1) and (8) we have the convergence in probability of the term involving $x_{jk} x_{\ell m}^T$. Furthermore, by condition (B3), we have that $E[\xi_{jk} x_{\ell m}] = E[\xi_{\ell m} x_{jk}] = 0$. It remains to be shown that the variance of the error-covariate averages tend
to zero. Consider the variance of the first error-covariate averages:

\[
V \left[ \frac{1}{|\Theta_i|} \sum_{(jk,\ell m) \in \Theta_i} \xi_{jk} x_{\ell m} \right] = \frac{1}{|\Theta_i|^2} \sum_{(jk,\ell m) \in \Theta_i} \sum_{(rs, tu) \in \Theta_i} \text{Cov} \left( \xi_{jk} x_{\ell m}, \xi_{rs} x_{tu} \right),
\]

(49)

\[
= \frac{1}{|\Theta_i|^2} \sum_{(jk,\ell m) \in \Theta_i} \sum_{(rs, tu) \in \Theta_i} \mathbb{E} \left[ x_{\ell m} x_{tu}^T \right] \text{Cov} \left( \xi_{jk}, \xi_{rs} \right).
\]

(50)

In writing (50), we use condition (B3) and simplify by conditioning on \(X\) and using the law of total variance. By the same counting arguments used to establish (47), there are \(|\Theta_i|^2\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})\) nonzero bounded covariances in (50). Thus, we have

\[
V \left[ \frac{1}{|\Theta_i|} \sum_{(jk,\ell m) \in \Theta_i} \xi_{jk} x_{\ell m} \right] = \frac{|\Theta_i|^2\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})}{|\Theta_i|^2} \to 0.
\]

(51)

Since the expectation and variance both tend to zero, we have

\[
\frac{1}{|\Theta_i|} \sum_{(jk,\ell m) \in \Theta_i} \xi_{jk} x_{\ell m} \to_p 0.
\]

(52)

The same argument applies to the second error-covariate term in (48). Thus, we have shown that consistency of \(\hat{\beta}\) implies

\[
\hat{\phi}_i - \tilde{\phi}_i \to_p 0.
\]

(53)

\[\square\]

D Proof of relationship between MSEs of \(\hat{V}_E\) and \(\hat{V}_{DC}\)

In this section, we prove that the MSE of \(\hat{V}[\hat{\beta}]\), conditional on \(X\), is lower when using the exchangeable estimator than that when using the dyadic clustering estimator with high probability in \(X\), assuming that the error structure is exchangeable. Before proving the
theorem, we provide a lemma that states that the MSE of the each estimator is asymptotically equivalent to the MSE of each estimator based on the true errors, which vastly simplifies the proof of the MSE theorem. Even so, we must consider higher order moments of $\xi$ than the covariances $\text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}, \xi_{lm})$. So, we also provide a lemma in which we define the covariance of any pair of product of error relations $\text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}\xi_{lm}, \xi_{rs}\xi_{tu})$ and define the limiting values of the covariance of the error averages, $n\text{Cov}(\tilde{\phi}_v, \tilde{\phi}_w)$, for every pair $(v, w) \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 5\} \times \{1, 2, \ldots, 5\}$.

In this Appendix, we use the notation $O(n^a)$ and $\Theta(n^a)$, for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$, to denote the convergence a sequence of numbers to a constant (possibly zero) and a nonzero constant, respectively, as $n$ grows to infinity. In other words, $X_n = O(n^a)$ means that the sequence $n^{-a}X_n$ converges to a constant that may be zero. The notation $X_n = \Theta(n^a)$ means that the sequence $n^{-a}X_n$ converges to a nonzero constant. Lastly, it follows that $X_n = O(n^{a-\epsilon})$ means that the sequence $n^{-a}X_n$ converges to zero.

We use similar notation for convergence of sequences of random variables. The notation $X_n = O_p(n^a)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ means that the sequence $n^{-a}X_n$ converges in distribution to a random variable (possibly a constant). The notation $X_n = o_p(n^a)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ means that the sequence $n^{-a}X_n$ converges in probability to zero. Finally, we define $X_n = \Theta_p(n^a)$ to mean that $n^{-a}X_n$ converges in distribution to a random variable with distribution that is not a point mass at zero, and thus possibly a nonzero constant (as will always be the case in this Appendix).

### D.1 Lemmas in support of Theorem 3

The first lemma describes the covariances of parameter estimates based on the errors, which arise in the proof of the MSE theorem. Of interest are the covariances $\text{Cov}(\tilde{\phi}_v, \tilde{\phi}_w)$ for $(v, w) \in \{3, 4, 5\} \times \{3, 4, 5\}$, as there are $\Theta(n)$ times as many of these covariances in $\hat{V}_E[\hat{\beta}]$ as those covariances where at least one of $v$ or $w$ is in $\{1, 2\}$. However, we provide limiting values of all covariances for completeness. The proof of this lemma follows from recognizing that
\( \tilde{\phi}_v \) is a sample average and from defining all possible covariances that make up \( \text{Cov} \left( \tilde{\phi}_v, \tilde{\phi}_w \right) \) and their multiplicities.

**Lemma 3.** If \( \xi \) is a mean zero random vector with positive definite covariance matrix in the exchangeable class, \( \Omega = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \phi_i S_i \), and \( \mathbb{E}[\xi_j^4] < L < \infty \), then the covariance \( n \text{Cov} \left( \tilde{\phi}_v, \tilde{\phi}_w \right) \) for \((v,w)\in\{1,2,\ldots,5\} \times \{1,2,\ldots,5\}\) converges to

\[
\text{nCov} \left( \tilde{\phi}_v, \tilde{\phi}_w \right) \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\sum_{i=1}^{4} \alpha_i \beta_v \beta_w C(v,w)_i & (v,w) \in \{3,4,5\} \times \{3,4,5\} \\
\sum_{j=1}^{3} \gamma_j F(v,w)_j & (v,w) \in \{1,2\} \times \{1,2\}, \\
\sum_{k=1}^{4} \gamma_k D(v,w)_k & \text{o.w.},
\end{cases}
\]

(54)

where
\[
\alpha_i := 1 + 1[i > 1] + 1[i = 4], \quad i \in \{1,2,3,4\},
\]
\[
\beta_i := 1 + 1[i = 5], \quad i \in \{1,2,3,4,5\},
\]
\[
\gamma_i := 1 + 1[i > 2], \quad i \in \{1,2,3,4\},
\]

and \( C(v,w)_i \), \( D(v,w)_i \), and \( F(v,w)_i \) are unknown finite constants equal to \( \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}\xi_{lm},\xi_{rs}\xi_{tu}) \) for various configurations of the sets \( \{j,k,l,m\} \) and \( \{r,s,t,u\} \).

**Proof.** By definition, the covariance is

\[
\text{nCov} \left( \tilde{\phi}_v, \tilde{\phi}_w \right) = n|\Theta_v|^{-1}|\Theta_w|^{-1} \sum_{(jk,lm)\in\Theta_v} \sum_{(rs,tu)\in\Theta_w} \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}\xi_{lm},\xi_{rs}\xi_{tu}).
\]

(55)

The sum is over \(|\Theta_v||\Theta_w|\) terms. Whenever \( \{j,k,l,m\}\cap\{r,s,t,u\} = \emptyset \), the covariance is zero. This removes a power of \( n \) from the sum in (55), such that the sum is over \( O(|\Theta_v||\Theta_w|n^{-1}) \) possibly nonzero covariances. The scaled sum in (55) converges – provided that the number of values that \( \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}\xi_{lm},\xi_{rs}\xi_{tu}) \) can take is finite – as each covariance is finite by assumption and the sequence of covariances is homogeneous as \( n \) grows by exchangeability.

In the remainder of the proof, we enumerate and define the covariances \( \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}\xi_{lm},\xi_{rs}\xi_{tu}) \) in (55) for particular pairs \((v,w)\in\{1,2,\ldots,5\} \times \{1,2,\ldots,5\}\), showing that the number
of values that \( \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}, \xi_{lm}, \xi_{rs}, \xi_{tu}) \) can take is finite. This is sufficient to establish convergence.

**Both \( v \) and \( w \) in \( \{3, 4, 5\} \):**

We begin by analyzing the case of interest, that is when both \( v \) and \( w \) are members of \( \{3, 4, 5\} \). As an example, we focus on \( v = 3 \) and \( w = 4 \), where the first product of error relations corresponds to the same-sender covariance (b) in Figure 1 and the second corresponds to the same-receiver covariance (c) in Figure 1. In this case, both \( |\Theta_3| = |\Theta_4| = \Theta(n^3) \). When \( v = 3 \) and \( w = 4 \), the covariance in (55) becomes

\[
n \text{Cov} \left( \tilde{\varphi}_3, \tilde{\varphi}_4 \right) = n^{-5} \sum_{jk} \sum_{l \notin \{j,k\}} \sum_{rs} \sum_{t \notin \{r,s\}} \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk} \xi_{jl}, \xi_{sr} \xi_{tr}) , (56)
\]

where ‘\( = \)’ denotes equality in the limit as \( n \) grows to infinity.

Only pairs of relation products that share a single actor will remain in the limit, as there are an order of \( n \) fewer covariances resulting from pairs of relation products that share two actors. One such pair of relation products that share a single actor correspond to the case when \( s = j \), i.e. \( \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk} \xi_{jt}, \xi_{jr} \xi_{tr}) \), of which there are \( \Theta(n^5) \) in the sum in (56). There are \( \Theta(n^4) \) covariances corresponding to the case when \( s = j \) and \( r = k \), i.e. \( \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk} \xi_{jl}, \xi_{jk} \xi_{tk}) \). The values of all covariances in (56) are finite by assumption and not equal in general. However, by exchangeability, covariances resulting from pairs of relations that share an actor in the same way are equal. For example, the covariance corresponding to \( s = j \) is the same regardless of the node labeling, that is \( \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk} \xi_{jl}, \xi_{jr} \xi_{tr}) = \text{Cov} (\xi_{ab} \xi_{ac}, \xi_{ad} \xi_{ed}) \) for any set \( \{a, b, c, d, e\} \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) with \( |\{a, b, c, d, e\}| = 5 \).

There are nine ways that we may have \( |\{j, k, l\} \cap \{r, s, t\}| = 1 \) in (56), i.e. there are nine ways that exactly one of \( \{j, k, l\} \) equals exactly one of \( \{r, s, t\} \). However, these reduce into four unique covariance values for each pair \( (v, w) \in \{3, 4, 5\} \times \{3, 4, 5\} \). As an example, when \( t = j \) the covariance is the same as that when \( s = j \), that is \( \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk} \xi_{jl}, \xi_{sr} \xi_{tr}) = \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk} \xi_{jl}, \xi_{sr} \xi_{jr}) \). Now we define these four covariance values and their multiplicities out of
the nine possible ways that exactly one of \( \{j, k, l\} \) equals exactly one of \( \{r, s, t\} \):

- When \( r = j \), we define the covariance \( C(3, 4)_1 := \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jl}, \xi_{sj}\xi_{tj}) \), of which there is one out of nine possible;

- When \( s = j \), the covariance is the same as when \( t = j \) (multiplicity two), and we define this covariance \( C(3, 4)_2 := \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jt}, \xi_{jr}\xi_{tr}) \);

- When \( r = k \), the covariance is the same as when \( r = l \) (multiplicity two), and we define this covariance \( C(3, 4)_3 := \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jt}, \xi_{sk}\xi_{tk}) \);

- We define the covariance when \( s = k \) to be \( C(3, 4)_4 := \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jt}, \xi_{kr}\xi_{tr}) \), of which there are four, the remaining terms of which correspond to \( t = k \), \( s = l \), and \( t = l \).

Now, noting that there are \( n^5 + \Theta(n^4) \) covariances in the sum (56) corresponding to each of the nine possible ways that exactly one of \( \{j, k, l\} \) equals exactly one of \( \{r, s, t\} \), we see that

\[
n \text{Cov} \left( \tilde{\phi}_3, \tilde{\phi}_4 \right) \to \ldots \to \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jt}, \xi_{sj}\xi_{tj}) + 2\text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jt}, \xi_{jr}\xi_{tr}) + 2\text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jt}, \xi_{sk}\xi_{tk}) + 4\text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jt}, \xi_{kr}\xi_{tr}) \equiv C(3, 4)_1 + 2C(3, 4)_2 + 2C(3, 4)_3 + 4C(3, 4)_4, \tag{57}
\]

where ‘\( \to \)’ denotes convergence in the limit as \( n \) goes to infinity. Under appropriate definition of \( C(v, w) \) for \( i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \), the same argument applies when both \( v \) and \( w \) are one of \( \{3, 4\} \). When \( w = 5 \) (relation products of the form \( \{\xi_{jk}\xi_{kl}\} \) and \( \{\xi_{jk}\xi_{lj}\} \)) and \( v = 3 \), however, we then must consider covariances \( \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jl}, \xi_{rs}\xi_{tr}) \) and \( \text{Cov} (\xi_{jk}\xi_{jl}, \xi_{sr}\xi_{rt}) \) from \( w = 5 \), which doubles the coefficients in (57). This accounts for \( \beta_w = 2 \) when \( w = 5 \) and \( \beta_w = 1 \) otherwise in (54). The same argument applies when \( v = 5 \).

**Both \( v \) and \( w \) in \( \{1, 2\} \):**

We now analyze both \( v \) and \( w \) in \( \{1, 2\} \), corresponding to variance and the reciprocal covariance (a) in Figure[1] In this case, both \( |\Theta_v| = |\Theta_w| = n(n - 1) \). Taking \( v = 1 \) and \( w = 1 \) as
an example, in the limit, the covariance in (55) is
\[
\text{nCov}\left(\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_2\right) = a n^{-3} \sum_{jk} \sum_{rs} \text{Cov}\left(\xi^2_{jk}, \xi^2_{rs}\right).
\] (58)

Again, we only consider covariances corresponding to pairs of relation products that share a single actor as only these covariances survive in the limit. There are four possible ways that \(\{j, k\}\) shares exactly one actor with \(\{r, s\}\). We define the three unique covariances and their multiplicities corresponding to the four ways that \(\{j, k\}\) shares exactly one actor with \(\{r, s\}\) as follows:

- When \(r = j\), we define the covariance \(F(1, 1)_1 := \text{Cov}\left(\xi^2_{jk}, \xi^2_{js}\right)\), of which there is one out of the four possibilities;
- When \(s = k\), we define the covariance \(F(1, 1)_2 := \text{Cov}\left(\xi^2_{jk}, \xi^2_{rk}\right)\), of which there is one;
- When \(s = j\), we define the covariance \(F(1, 2)_3 := \text{Cov}\left(\xi^2_{jk}, \xi^2_{rj}\right)\), which is the same as when \(r = k\), accounting for the remaining two possibilities.

Now, the fact that there are \(n^3 + \Theta(n^2)\) covariances in the sum (58) corresponding to each of the four possible ways that \(\{j, k\}\) shares exactly one actor with \(\{r, s\}\) gives that
\[
\text{nCov}\left(\tilde{\phi}_1, \tilde{\phi}_1\right) \to \text{Cov}\left(\xi^2_{jk}, \xi^2_{js}\right) + \text{Cov}\left(\xi^2_{jk}, \xi^2_{rk}\right) + 2\text{Cov}\left(\xi^2_{jk}, \xi^2_{rj}\right) \quad \text{(59)}
\]
\[
:= F(1, 1)_1 + F(1, 1)_2 + 2F(1, 1)_3.
\]

Of course, the same argument applies to any \(v\) and \(w\) both in \(\{1, 2\}\). In the case where \(v = 1\) and \(w = 2\), by symmetry, \(F(1, 2)_1 = F(1, 2)_2\). Similarly, for \(v = w = 2\), all \(F(2, 2)_1 = F(2, 2)_2 = F(2, 2)_3\).

**One of \(v\) and \(w\) in \(\{1, 2\}\) and the other in \(\{3, 4, 5\}\):**

Similar counting arguments to those in the previous paragraphs apply when one of \(v, w\) is in
\{3, 4, 5\} and the other is in \{1, 2\}. As an example, consider \(v = 1\) and \(w = 3\). Once again, only pairs of relations that share a single actor will remain in the limit. Then, in the limit, the covariance in (55) becomes

\[
n \text{Cov}(\tilde{\phi}_2, \tilde{\phi}_3) = a n^{-4} \sum_{jk} \sum_{rs} \sum_{t \in \{r, s\}} \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{rs} \xi_{rt}). \quad (60)
\]

Now, there are six ways in which the first pair of relations share an actor with the second pair, i.e. all sets with exactly one actor from \(\{j, k\}\) equal to exactly one other from \(\{r, s, t\}\). We define the covariances corresponding to the six possibilities below:

- When \(r = j\), we define the covariance \(D(1, 3)_1 := \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{js} \xi_{jt})\), of which there is one out of the six possibilities;
- When \(r = k\), we define the covariance \(D(1, 3)_2 := \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{ks} \xi_{kt})\), of which there is one;
- The overlaps where \(s = j\) and \(t = j\) result in the same covariance (multiplicity two), which we define \(D(1, 3)_3 := \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{rj} \xi_{rt})\);
- The overlaps where \(s = k\) and \(t = k\) result in the same covariance (multiplicity two), which we define \(D(1, 3)_4 := \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{rk} \xi_{rt})\).

Then, noting that there are \(n^4 + \Theta(n^3)\) covariances in the sum (60) corresponding to each of the six possible ways that exactly one actor from \(\{j, k\}\) is equal to exactly one other from \(\{r, s, t\}\), we have that

\[
n \text{Cov}(\tilde{\phi}_2, \tilde{\phi}_3) \to \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{js} \xi_{jt}) + \text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{ks} \xi_{kt}) + 2\text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{rj} \xi_{rt}) + 2\text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{rk} \xi_{rt}), \quad (61)
\]

\[
:= D(1, 3)_1 + D(1, 3)_2 + 2D(1, 3)_3 + 2D(1, 3)_4.
\]

When \(D(v, w)_k\) for \(k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\) is appropriately defined, the same argument applies for all settings where one of \(v, w\) is in \(\{3, 4\}\) and the other is in \(\{1, 2\}\). When \(w = 5\) (relation products of the form \(\{\xi_{jk} \xi_{kt}\}\) and \(\{\xi_{jk} \xi_{lj}\}\)), however, we then must consider covariances
in (60) $\text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{rs}^2)$ and $\text{Cov}(\xi_{jk}^2, \xi_{sr}^2)$, which doubles the coefficients in (61). This accounts for $\beta_w = 2$ when $w = 5$ and $\beta_w = 1$ otherwise in (54). We note that when $v = 2$, for example, we have the simplification that $D(2,3)_1 = D(2,3)_2$ and $D(2,3)_3 = D(2,3)_4$. \[ \square \]

The expressions for the estimators based on the errors are simpler to analyze than those based on the residuals. For example, when comparing the MSEs of the exchangeable and dyadic clustering estimators, it is desirable to analyze $MSE_{\xi}(\tilde{V}_E|X)$ instead of $MSE_{\xi}(\hat{V}_E|X)$. The following lemma allows us to do just this. This lemma states that MSEs of the estimators based on the errors are asymptotically equivalent to the MSEs of those based on the residuals. The proof consists of first evaluating the MSE conditional on $X$. We then show that $n^3MSE_{\xi}(\tilde{V}_E|X)$ converges in $X$-probability to a nonzero constant in general and that $n^3MSE_{\xi}(\tilde{V}_E|X) - n^3MSE_{\xi}(\hat{V}_E|X)$ converges in $X$-probability to zero, implying that the difference between $MSE_{\xi}(\tilde{V}_E|X)$ and $MSE_{\xi}(\hat{V}_E|X)$ is asymptotically negligible. We repeat the procedure for $MSE_{\xi}(\tilde{V}_{DC}|X)$ and $MSE_{\xi}(\hat{V}_{DC}|X)$.

**Lemma 4.** Assuming $\mathbb{E}(|x_{jk}^{(l)}|^8) < L^8 < \infty$ for all $l \in \{1,2,\ldots,p\}$ and under the assumptions of Theorem 1, the MSE for both the exchangeable and dyadic clustering estimators based on the residuals is asymptotically equivalent to the MSE of each respective estimator based on the errors. That is,

$$n^3MSE_{\xi}(\tilde{V}_E|X) = n^3MSE_{\xi}(\hat{V}_E|X) + O_p(n^{-1/2}) = O_p(1), \quad (62)$$

and analogously for dyadic clustering.

**Proof.** We will focus on the exchangeable estimator first, and then the dyadic clustering estimator. Throughout, we drop the conditioning on $X$ in the MSE as it is understood, for example $MSE_{\xi}(\tilde{V}_E) := MSE_{\xi}(\tilde{V}_E|X)$.

**Exchangeable estimator:**
By definition, the MSE of the exchangeable estimator is

$$MSE_{\xi} (\tilde{V}_E) = \mathbb{E} \left[ (\tilde{V}_E - V^*)^2 \mid X \right],$$

(63)

$$= MSE_{\xi} (\tilde{V}_E) + \mathbb{E} \left[ (\tilde{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E)^2 \mid X \right] + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ (\tilde{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E)(\tilde{V}_E - V^*) \mid X \right].$$

(64)

where $V^* := V[\hat{\beta}]$, the true variance of the OLS coefficient estimate. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ (\tilde{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E)(\tilde{V}_E - V^*) \mid X \right] \leq \sqrt{MSE_{\xi} (\tilde{V}_E)} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\tilde{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E)^2 \mid X \right].$$

(65)

If we show that $n^3MSE_{\xi} (\tilde{V}_E)$ converges in $X$-probability to a constant, i.e. $MSE_{\xi} (\tilde{V}_E) = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-3})$, and that $\mathbb{E} \left[ (\tilde{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E)^2 \mid X \right] = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-4})$, then (65) implies that the third additive term of (64) is $\mathcal{O}_p(n^{-7/2})$. This is sufficient to establish (62). We begin with showing $n^3MSE_{\xi} (\tilde{V}_E) = \mathcal{O}_p(1)$. By definition,

$$n^3MSE_{\xi} (\tilde{V}_E) = n^3\mathbb{E} \left[ \text{tr} (\tilde{V}_E^2) \mid X \right]$$

$$= \sum_{v=1}^{5} \sum_{w=1}^{5} n \text{Cov} \left( \tilde{\phi}_v, \tilde{\phi}_w \right) \text{tr} \left( \left( \frac{X^TX}{n^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{X^TS_vX}{n^3} \right)^{-2} \left( \frac{X^TS_wX}{n^3} \right)^{-2} \left( \frac{X^TX}{n^2} \right)^{-1} \right).$$

(66)

By Lemma 3, $n \text{Cov} \left( \tilde{\phi}_v, \tilde{\phi}_w \right)$ converges to a finite constant for every $(v, w) \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 5\} \times \{1, 2, \ldots, 5\}$. The convergence in probability of each multiplicative term in (66) containing $X$ is defined by assumption (B1); only those with both $v$ and $w$ in $\{3, 4, 5\}$ survive in the limit as these have $|\Theta_v| = \Theta(n^3)$ whereas $|\Theta_v| = \Theta(n^2)$ for $v \in \{1, 2\}$. Thus, we have that

$$n^3MSE_{\xi} (\tilde{V}_E) \xrightarrow{p_X} \sum_{v=3}^{5} \sum_{w=3}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \alpha_{i\beta_v\beta_w}C(v, w) \text{tr} \left( M_1^{-1} M_u M_1^{-2} M_w M_1^{-1} \right),$$

(67)

which is finite.

It remains to show that $\mathbb{E} \left[ (\tilde{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E)^2 \mid X \right] = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-4})$. To establish this fact, it is sufficient to show that $\tilde{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-2})$, and then, by the continuous mapping theorem,
\[
(\hat{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E)^2 = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-4}), \text{ which implies the desired result. Writing directly,}
\]
\[
\hat{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=1}^{5} (\hat{\phi}_v - \tilde{\phi}_v) \left( \frac{X^T X}{n^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{X^T S_v X}{n^3} \right) \left( \frac{X^T X}{n^2} \right)^{-1}.
\]

By assumption (B1), the multiplicative terms involving \(X\) converge in probability to constants. To establish \(\hat{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-2})\), it is sufficient show that \(\hat{\phi}_v - \tilde{\phi}_v = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1})\) for all \(v \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 5\}\). Writing this expression directly,
\[
\hat{\phi}_v - \tilde{\phi}_v = - (\hat{\beta} - \beta)^T \left( \sum_{(jk,lm) \in \Theta_v} \frac{x_{jk} \xi_{lm} + x_{lm} \xi_{jk}}{|\Theta_v|} \right) + (\hat{\beta} - \beta)^T \left( \sum_{(jk,lm) \in \Theta_v} \frac{x_{jk} x_{lm}^T}{|\Theta_v|} \right) (\hat{\beta} - \beta).
\]

By Theorem 1, \(\hat{\beta} - \beta = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1/2})\). Also, by assumption (B1), the sum involving \(X\) in the second term converges in probability to a constant; thus, the second additive term in (69) is \(\mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1})\). Turning to the first additive term, we notice its expectation is zero, that is \(\mathbb{E}[x_{jk} \xi_{lm}] = 0\) for all relations \(jk\) and \(lm\). The variance is
\[
\mathbb{V} \left[ \sum_{(jk,lm) \in \Theta_v} \frac{x_{jk} \xi_{lm} + x_{lm} \xi_{jk}}{|\Theta_v|} \right] = \frac{1}{|\Theta_v|^2} \sum_{(jk,lm) \in \Theta_v} \sum_{(rs, tu) \in \Theta_v} \mathbb{E} \left[ x_{jk} x_{rs}^T \xi_{lm} \xi_{tu} \right] = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}),
\]
where we use the fact that \(\mathbb{E} \left[ x_{jk} x_{rs}^T \xi_{lm} \xi_{tu} \right] \) is only nonzero when relation \(lm\) shares an actor with relation \(tu\) since \(\mathbb{E} [\xi_{lm} \xi_{tu}] = 0\) whenever \(\{j, k\} \cap \{l, m\} = \emptyset\) and \(X\) is independent \(\xi\) by assumption (B3). This fact removes at least a factor of \(n\) from the sum. Thus, we have that \(\sum_{(jk,lm) \in \Theta_v} \frac{x_{jk} \xi_{lm} + x_{lm} \xi_{jk}}{|\Theta_v|} = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1/2})\), which gives that \(\hat{\phi}_v - \tilde{\phi}_v = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1})\) and
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \hat{V}_E - \tilde{V}_E \right)^2 \mid X \right] = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-4}),
\]
which establishes (62) for the exchangeable estimator.

**Dyadic clustering estimator:**
The same argument following (64) applies to the dyadic clustering estimator. To establish (62) for the dyadic clustering estimator, it is thus sufficient to show that \(n^3 MSE_\xi \left( \hat{V}_{DC} \right) \) converges in \(X\)-probability to a constant and that \(\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \hat{V}_{DC} - \tilde{V}_{DC} \right)^2 \mid X \right] = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-4})\). We
begin with the former. By definition, \( n^3 \text{MSE}_\xi \left( \tilde{V}_{DC} \right) \) is

\[
\frac{1}{n^5} \sum_{(jk,lm) \in \Theta_v} \sum_{(rs, tu) \in \Theta_w} \text{Cov} \left( \xi_{jk} \xi_{lm}, \xi_{rs} \xi_{tu} \right) \text{tr} \left( \left( \frac{X^TX}{n^2} \right)^{-1} x_{jk} x_{lm}^T \left( \frac{X^TX}{n^2} \right)^{-2} x_{rs} x_{tu}^T \left( \frac{X^TX}{n^2} \right)^{-1} \right),
\]

(72)

where \( \Theta_0 \) is the set of relation pairs that share an actor in any manner. Then, substituting the asymptotic values for \( \text{Cov} \left( \xi_{jk} \xi_{lm}, \xi_{rs} \xi_{tu} \right) \) from Lemma 3 and separating the sum by the five ways that two relations may share an actor,

\[
n^3 \text{MSE}_\xi \left( \tilde{V}_{DC} \right) = \frac{1}{n^5} \sum_{v=3}^5 \sum_{w=3}^5 \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{(v,w)_i} C(v,w)_i \, x_{lm}^T M_1^{-2} x_{rs} x_{tu}^T M_1^{-2} x_{jk},
\]

(73)

where \( \smallfrown = \smallfrown_i \) denotes equality in the limit and \( T(v,w)_i \) is the set of relations \( (jk,lm,rs,tu) \) such that \( (jk,lm) \in \Theta_v \) and \( (rs,tu) \in \Theta_w \) and such that the pairs of relations \( (jk,lm) \) and \( (rs,tu) \) share a single actor as appropriate for \( C(v,w)_i \) in Lemma 3. In (73), we substitute the limit of \( \left( \frac{X^TX}{n^2} \right)^{-2} \) from assumption (B1). Also in (73), only terms with \( v \) and \( w \) both in \( \{3,4,5\} \) survive in the limit as the set \( |T(v,w)_i| = \Theta(n^5) \) (as detailed in Lemma 3), while the order is less for either \( v \) or \( w \) in \( \{1,2\} \), so these terms vanish in the limit. Evaluating the vector products, the expression on the right hand side of (73) equal to

\[
\sum_{v=3}^5 \sum_{w=3}^5 \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_{(v,w)_i} C(v,w)_i \cdot \left( m_1^{-2} \right)_{ab} \cdot \left( m_1^{-2} \right)_{cd} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{n^5} \sum_{T(v,w)_i} x_{lm}^{(a)} x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} x_{jk}^{(d)} \right),
\]

(74)

where \( \left( m_1^{-2} \right)_{ab} \) is the \( (a,b) \) entry in \( M_1^{-2} \), e.g., and \( x_{jk}^{(a)} \) is the entry in \( X \) pertaining to column \( a \) and relation \( jk \). Further, the variance

\[
V \left( \frac{1}{n^5} \sum_{T(v,w)_i} x_{lm}^{(a)} x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} x_{jk}^{(d)} \right) = \frac{1}{n^{10}} \sum_{T(v,w)_i} U(v,w)_i \sum_{U(v,w)_i} \text{Cov} \left( x_{lm}^{(a)} x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} x_{jk}^{(d)}, x_{ef}^{(a)} x_{gh}^{(b)} x_{np}^{(c)} x_{yz}^{(d)} \right),
\]

(75)

\[
= \frac{\Theta(n^9)}{n^{10}} \to 0,
\]

(76)

where \( U(v,w)_i = T(v,w)_i \) and \( (lm,rs,tu,jk) \) indexes the first sum and \( (ef,gh,np,yz) \) indexes the second sum. The convergence is the result of the independence portion of assumption in (B1) and the bounded moment assumption on \( X \). The variance in (75) converges to zero for every set of covariates \( \{a,b,c,d\} \), every relation type \( v \) and \( w \) both in
\{3, 4, 5\}, and every covariance type \(i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\). Thus, provided that the expectation of 
\(n^{-5} \sum_{T(v,w)_i} x_{lm}^{(a)} x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} x_{jk}^{(d)}\) converges to a constant, this expression converges in probability

to that same constant. This expectation is

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ x_{lm}^{(a)} x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} x_{jk}^{(d)} \right] = \text{Cov} \left( x_{jk}^{(d)} x_{lm}^{(a)}, x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} \right) + (m_v)_a (m_w)_b ,
\]

where \((m_v)_{ij}\) is the \((i, j)\) entry in \(M_v\) and we use the symmetry of \(M_v\) for all \(v \in \{3, 4, 5\}\).

Unlike \(\xi\), for a given \(i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\), the covariances in (77) may not be the same for two relation sets in \(T(v, w)_i\). However, by assumption (B1) and taking \(i = 1, v = 3,\) and \(w = 4\) for example, we still have that

\[
\text{Cov} \left( x_{jl}^{(d)} x_{s_1}^{(a)}, x_{i_j}^{(b)} x_{j_k}^{(c)} \right) = \text{Cov} \left( x_{e_f}^{(d)} x_{g_e}^{(a)}, x_{h_e}^{(b)} x_{e_p}^{(c)} \right), \quad \text{for } \{|j, k, l, s, t, e, f, g, h, p\}| = 10. \tag{78}
\]

That is, covariances that share an actor in the same way are still equal. So, for fixed 
\(i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\) and pair of \(v\) and \(w\) both in \(\{3, 4, 5\}\), we may collect the \(\alpha_i\) possible covariances and average them to attain the convergent value. We thus define the limit

\[
\frac{1}{n^5} \sum_{T(v,w)_i} \text{Cov} \left( x_{jk}^{(d)} x_{lm}^{(a)}, x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} \right) \rightarrow \alpha_i \beta_v \beta_w \frac{1}{\alpha_i} \sum_{W(v,w)_i} \text{Cov} \left( x_{jk}^{(d)} x_{lm}^{(a)}, x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} \right), \tag{79}
\]

\[
:= \alpha_i \beta_v \beta_w C_{X}^{(d,a,b,c)}(v, w)_i, \tag{80}
\]

where \(W(v, w)_i\) is the set of \(\alpha_i\) ways that \((jk, lm, rs, tu)\) correspond to \(T(v, w)_i\). For example, 
when \(i = 4, v = 3,\) and \(w = 4, W(v, w)_i\) contains four index sets corresponding to the four multiplicity
of \(C(v, w)_4\) as defined in Lemma (3). The convergence of (79) results from (78). 
As the average over is \(W(v, w)_i\) is over a finite number of terms, i.e. each \(\alpha_i\) is bounded, 
there is no possibility of divergence. We note that the covariances in (79) are finite by 
assumption (B2) and \(\beta_v \beta_w\) arises from the asymptotic limit of \(n^{-5}|T(v, w)_i|\). Taking (79) 
together with (77), we have the convergence of the expectation of 
\(n^{-5} \sum_{T(v,w)_i} x_{lm}^{(a)} x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} x_{jk}^{(d)}\). 
Along with (75), convergence of the expectation of \(n^{-5} \sum_{T(v,w)_i} x_{lm}^{(a)} x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} x_{jk}^{(d)}\) establishes the
convergence of $n^{-5} \sum_{T(v,w)} x_{im}^{(a)} x_{rs}^{(b)} x_{tu}^{(c)} x_{jk}^{(d)}$ to the same limit.

Now, for a particular $v$ and $w$ both in $\{3, 4, 5\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we collect the set of $\{C_X^{d,a,b,c}(v, w, i)\}$ for every $a, b, c, \text{ and } d$ in $\{1, 2, \ldots, p\}$ from (80) into a $p^2 \times p^2$ matrix defined $D_X(v, w, i)$. Substituting this definition into (74) while noting each $\{M_v\}_{v=1}^{5}$ is symmetric, the convergent value for the dyadic clustering estimator is

$$n^3 \text{MSE}_\xi \left( \tilde{V}_{DC} \right) \overset{\mathbb{P}}{\to} \ldots$$

$$\ldots \to \sum_{v=3}^{5} \sum_{w=3}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \alpha_i \beta_v \beta_w C(v, w, i) \left( \text{vec} \left( M^{-2} \right)^T D_X(v, w, i) \text{vec} \left( M^{-2} \right) + \text{tr} \left( M^{-2} M_v M^{-2} M_w \right) \right). \tag{81}$$

Noting that the convergent value in (81) is a finite constant, it remains to show that $\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \tilde{V}_{DC} - \tilde{V}_{DC} \right)^2 \mid X \right] = O_p(n^{-4})$. As with the exchangeable estimator, it is sufficient to show that $\tilde{V}_{DC} - \tilde{V}_{DC} = O_p(n^{-2})$. Using the residual definition $e_{jk} = \xi_{jk} + x_j^T(\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta})$, the expression for $\tilde{V}_{DC} - \tilde{V}_{DC}$ is

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=1}^{5} \sum_{w=1}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \left( \frac{X^T X}{n^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{x_{jk} x_{lm}^T}{n^3} (e_{jk} e_{lm} - \xi_{jk} \xi_{lm}) \right) \left( \frac{X^T X}{n^2} \right)^{-1} a \ldots$$

$$\ldots = a \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=1}^{5} \sum_{w=1}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{4} M_{1}^{-1} \left( \frac{x_{jk} x_{lm}^T}{n^3} \left( x_j^T \left( \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta} \right) \left( \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta} \right)^T x_{lm} \right) - 2 x_j^T \left( \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta} \right) \xi_{lm} \right) M_{1}^{-1}, \tag{82}$$

where we substitute the convergence of $\left( \frac{X^T X}{n^2} \right)^{-1}$ to $M_{1}^{-1}$ and have used the exchangeability property to get the factor of two on the second additive term in the center of (82). Analyzing the first additive term in the center of (82),

$$\sum_{v=1}^{5} \sum_{w=1}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \left( \frac{x_{jk} x_{lm}^T}{n^3} \left( x_j^T \left( \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta} \right) \left( \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta} \right)^T x_{lm} \right) \right) = \ldots$$

$$\ldots = a \sum_{j=1}^{5} \sum_{k=1}^{5} \sum_{l=1}^{5} \sum_{m=1}^{5} \left( \frac{x_{jk} x_{lm}^T}{n^2} \right) \left( \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta} \right) \left( \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta} \right)^T \left( \frac{x_{lm} x_{lm}^T}{n} \right), \tag{83}$$

$$= \Theta_p(1) O_p(n^{-1/2}) O_p(n^{-1/2}) \Theta_p(1) = O_p(n^{-1}), \tag{84}$$

recalling the notation that $\Theta_{jk}$ is the set of all relations that share an actor with relation $jk$ and that $|\Theta_{jk}| = \Theta(n)$. We attain the convergence rate by noting that the $X$-terms
in (83) converge in probability to constants by assumption (B1) and \( \hat{\beta} - \beta = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1/2}) \) by Theorem 1. The convergences in (83) are for \( p \times p \) matrices; these convergences are element-wise.

We now analyze the convergence rate of the second additive term in the center of (82).

\[
\sum_{v=1}^{5} \sum_{(jk,lm) \in \Theta_v} \frac{x_{jk} x_{lm}^T}{n^3} \left( x_{jk}^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta) \xi_{lm} \right) = \sum_{lm, jk \in \Theta_{lm}} \frac{\left( x_{jk} x_{jk}^T \right)}{n} \left( \frac{\xi_{lm} x_{lm}^T}{n^2} \right) (\hat{\beta} - \beta),
\]

which is equal to
\[
\Theta_p(1) \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1/2}) \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1/2}) = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1}).
\]

Again, the convergence of the first multiplicative term is a result of assumption (B1) and \( \hat{\beta} - \beta = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1/2}) \) by Theorem 1. The mean \( n^{-2} \sum_{lm} x_{lm} \xi_{lm} \) is expectation zero and \( \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-1/2}) \) by previous arguments, for example in (37). Thus, we have \( \hat{V}_{DC} - \tilde{V}_{DC} = \mathcal{O}_p(n^{-2}) \), and the dyadic clustering estimator satisfies the relation in (62).

**D.2 Proof of Theorem 3**

We now establish that the MSE of the exchangeable estimator is less than that of the dyadic clustering estimator with high probability. To do so, we show that the value to which the difference in MSEs converges is nonnegative. Throughout the proof, we drop the conditioning on \( X \) in the MSE as it is understood, for example \( \text{MSE}_{\xi}(\hat{V}_E) := \text{MSE}_{\xi}(\hat{V}_E|X) \).

The asymptotic difference in MSEs is as follows, where we substitute the expressions for the estimators based on the errors in (67) and (81), as justified by Lemma 4:

\[
n^3 \left( \text{MSE}_{\xi}(\hat{V}_{DC}) - \text{MSE}_{\xi}(\hat{V}_E) \right) \xrightarrow{p_X} \ldots 
\]

\[
\ldots \frac{p_X}{5} \sum_{v=3}^{5} \sum_{w=3}^{4} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \alpha_i \beta_v \beta_w C(v,w) \text{vec} \left( M_{i-2} \right)^T D_X(v,w) \text{vec} \left( M_{i-2} \right). \tag{87}
\]

It remains to show that this is a nonnegative constant. To do so, we show that the matrix in the quadratic form in (87) is the limit of a variance matrix, and thus positive semi-definite.
We will show that the scaled variance

\[
\frac{1}{n^5} V \left[ \sum_{v=1}^{5} \sum_{k,l,m \in \Theta_v} \xi_{jk} \xi_{lm} \text{vec} \left( x_{jk} x_{lm}^T \right) \right] = \ldots
\]

\[
\ldots = \frac{1}{n^5} \sum_{v=1}^{5} \sum_{w=1}^{5} \sum_{j,k,l,m \in \Theta_v} \sum_{r,s,t,u \in \Theta_w} \text{Cov} \left( \xi_{jk} \xi_{lm} \text{vec} \left( x_{jk} x_{lm}^T \right), \xi_{rs} \xi_{tu} \text{vec} \left( x_{rs} x_{tu}^T \right) \right),
\]

converges to the desired matrix. First, we note that the sum in (88) is \( \Theta(n^5) \) as the relations \( jk \) and \( lm \) must share at least one actor with the relations \( rs \) and \( tu \) for the covariance to be nonzero. Then, by the arguments in Lemma 3, only pairs of relations that share a single actor survive in the limit. Finally, by assumption (B3), \( X \) is independent \( \xi \) and the variance in (88) is asymptotically equivalent to

\[
\frac{1}{n^5} \sum_{v=3}^{5} \sum_{w=3}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \alpha_i \beta_v \beta_w C(v,w)_i \mathbb{E} \left[ (\xi_{jk} \xi_{lm} - \phi_v) (\xi_{rs} \xi_{tu} - \phi_w) \right] \times \ldots
\]

\[
\ldots \times \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \text{vec} \left( x_{jk} x_{lm}^T \right) - \text{vec} \left( M_i \right) \right) \left( \text{vec} \left( x_{rs} x_{tu}^T \right) - \text{vec} \left( M_w \right) \right)^T \right],
\]

where only terms with both \( v \) and \( w \) in \{3, 4, 5\} survive in the limit. Then, by assumptions (A1) and (B1) and applying Lemma 3, the variance converges to

\[
\frac{1}{n^5} V \left[ \sum_{v=1}^{5} \sum_{k,l,m \in \Theta_v} \xi_{jk} \xi_{lm} \text{vec} \left( x_{jk} x_{lm}^T \right) \right] \rightarrow \sum_{v=3}^{5} \sum_{w=3}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \alpha_i \beta_v \beta_w C(v,w)_i D_X(v,w)_i,
\]

where we substitute the definition of \( D_X(v,w)_i \) following (80). Thus, the matrix in (90) is positive semi-definite. Now, (87) becomes

\[
3 \left( MSE_\xi \left( \widehat{V}_{DC} \right) - MSE_\xi \left( \widehat{V}_E \right) \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_X} \ldots
\]

\[
\ldots \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}_X} \text{vec} \left( M_1^{-2} \right)^T \left( \sum_{v=3}^{5} \sum_{w=3}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{4} \alpha_i \beta_v \beta_w C(v,w)_i D_X(v,w)_i \right) \text{vec} \left( M_1^{-2} \right) \geq 0.
\]
E Simulation study details

As noted in Section 4, 500 random realizations of covariates were generated for each sample size of actors $n \in \{20, 40, 80, 160, 320\}$. For each covariate realization, 1,000 random error realizations were generated for each of the three error settings: IID, exchangeable, and non-exchangeable. Using (11), a simulated data set was created from each covariate realization and error realization pair. The regression model was fit using ordinary least squares to each data set, and standard errors were estimated using the exchangeable, dyadic clustering, and heteroskedasticity-consistent sandwich variance estimators. Confidence interval coverage was estimated for each covariate realization by counting the fraction of confidence intervals that contain the true coefficient.

For all simulations, we fixed true coefficients $\beta = [1, 1, 1, 1]^T$. We drew each $x_{2i}$ from a Bernoulli(1/2) distribution independently. In the rare event that $x_{2i} = x_{2j}$ for all $(i, j)$ pairs, one realization $x_{2k}$ was randomly flipped to a 1 or 0. All $x_{3i}$ and $x_{4ij}$ were drawn independently from a standard normal distribution.

Each error setting was specified to have the same total variance: $\sum_{ij} \text{Var}(\xi_{ij}) = 3n(n-1)$. This variance was chosen so that the variance of the error would be similar to that of the regression mean model $\beta^T x_{ij}$. In the IID errors setting, $\xi_{ij} \sim iid \mathcal{N}(0, 3)$ for all $(i, j)$. To generate the non-exchangeable errors, a mean-zero random effect was added to the upper left quadrant of $V[\Xi_v]$. The errors for the non-exchangeable error setting may be written

$$\xi_{ij} = \tau 1_{i \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor} 1_{j \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor} + \epsilon_{ij}, \quad \tau \sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{9n}{4\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}\right), \quad \epsilon_{ij} \sim iid \mathcal{N}(0, 3/4).$$

Finally, the distribution of the exchangeable (bilinear mixed effects model) error setting is defined in (7). We selected the dimension of the latent space to be $d = 2$, the correlation between sender and receiver effects as $\rho_{ab} = 1/2$, and the sender variance to be twice that of receiver variance: $\sigma_a^2 = 2\sigma_b^2$. We further specified $\sigma_z = \sigma_\gamma = \sigma_b$. Finally, we selected $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 3/4$. With the aforementioned choices, the restriction $\sum_{ij} \text{Var}(\xi_{ij}) = 3n(n-1)$ generated a
quadratic equation in $\sigma_b$. The standard deviations that resulted from solving this quadratic equation are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Approximate standard deviations for exchangeable error setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\sigma_\varepsilon$</th>
<th>$\sigma_a$</th>
<th>$\sigma_b$</th>
<th>$\sigma_\gamma$</th>
<th>$\sigma_z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: (IID Errors) The top row of plots are the average differences in standard errors across random realizations of $X$, where the average is taken over 1,000 error realizations. The bottom row of plots show the standard deviations of the standard error estimates across random $X$. Lines in the boxplots denote the median, the box denotes the middle 80% of values, and the whiskers denote the middle 95% of values.

E.1 Confidence interval widths

To examine the relative confidence interval widths between the exchangeable and dyadic clustering sandwich variance estimators, it is sufficient to examine the values of the standard
error estimates. In all simulations we generate 95% confidence intervals by using the typical normal approximation of plus or minus 1.96 times the standard error. We plot the empirical expected standard error given $X$ relative to the true standard error given $X$ in Figures 8-10. We estimate the expectation by averaging the standard error estimates across the 1,000 error realizations, for each $X$ realization. We also compute the standard deviation of the standard error estimates given $X$.

We observe that, for IID and exchangeable error structures in Figures 8 and 9, the standard errors resulting from the exchangeable estimator are much closer to the true standard errors than those resulting from the dyadic clustering estimator. This fact suggests that the dyadic clustering estimator fails to account for a portion of the dependency in the error structure. We note that both procedures generally produce underestimates of the true standard errors, however, the dyadic clustering estimator trades some efficiency for robustness. We observe that the standard deviation of the standard error estimates when using the exchangeable estimator are typically lower than those when using dyadic clustering under IID and exchangeable errors. Intuitively, the lower variability of the exchangeable estimator relative to the dyadic clustering estimator the result of the averaging present in the exchangeable estimator. Finally, the trends of larger expectation and smaller standard deviation are present for most of the realizations of $X$ under non-exchangeable errors (Figure 10). This is true despite the fact that we might expect the dyadic clustering estimator to account for the heterogenous, non-exchangeable error structure more effectively than the exchangeable estimator since the dyadic clustering estimator is claimed to be robust.

\section{DC covariance matrix invertibility}

Ideally, for a covariance matrix estimate $\hat{\Omega}$ to be of utmost utility, it must be invertible. For example, if we wish to reweight the estimating equations, as in GEE, and solve iteratively for both the variance matrix and regression coefficients simultaneously, the estimate of the
Figure 9: (Exchangeable Errors) The top row of plots are the average differences in standard errors across random realizations of $X$, where the average is taken over 1,000 error realizations. The bottom row of plots show the standard deviations of the standard error estimates across random $X$. Lines in the boxplots denote the median, the box denotes the middle 80% of values, and the whiskers denote the middle 95% of values. The ordinate axis is truncated where appropriate to show the estimators of interest.

the covariance matrix must be nonsingular. However, in many cases the DC estimator is singular and hence cannot be used as a reweighting matrix. In cases when the DC estimator is singular, it can still be used in the ‘meat’ ($B$ matrix) in the coefficient sandwich estimator covariance matrix.

**Theorem 5.** The dyadic clustering estimate of the error variance, $\hat{\Omega}_{DC}$, is singular for directed data.

**Proof.** The DC estimator can be written as the Hadamard product between the outer product
Figure 10: (Non-exchangeable Errors) The top row of plots are the average differences in standard errors across random realizations of $X$, where the average is taken over 1,000 error realizations. The bottom row of plots show the standard deviations of the standard error estimates across random $X$. Lines in the boxplots denote the median, the box denotes the middle 80% of values, and the whiskers denote the middle 95% of values. The ordinate axis is truncated where appropriate to show the estimators of interest.

of the residuals and a matrix of indicators of whether the dyad indices share a member.

$$\hat{\Omega}_{DC} = ee^T \circ 1_{\{(i,j) \cap \{k,l\} \neq \emptyset\}}$$

The rank of the outer product of the residuals is one: $\text{rank}(ee^T) = 1$. The rank of the indicator matrix is at most $n(n - 1)/2$, since the indices $(i, j)$ share a member with an arbitrary pair $(k, \ell)$ if and only if the indices $(j, i)$ do as well. Thus, the column of $1_{\{(i,j) \cap \{k,l\} \neq \emptyset\}}$ corresponding to $(i, j)$ is the same as that corresponding to $(j, i)$.

For any two square matrices of equal size $A$ and $B$, $\text{rank}(A \circ B) \leq \text{rank}(A)\text{rank}(B)$. 

---

\[1_{x_{2i} \in C} 1_{x_{2j} \in C} |X_{3i} - X_{3j}| x_{4ij} - 50 \leq 0 \leq 50 \leq 100\]
Thus,

\[
\text{rank}(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}) = \text{rank}(ee^T \circ 1_{\{i,j\} \cap \{k,l\} \neq \emptyset}) \\
\leq \text{rank}(ee^T) \text{rank}(1_{\{i,j\} \cap \{k,l\} \neq \emptyset}) \\
\leq \frac{n(n-1)}{2}
\]

\(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}\) is therefore not full rank. \(\blacksquare\)

**Remark 1.** Theorem 5 does not hold for undirected data when \(R = 1\). If the data are undirected, then the bound does not guarantee singularity of \(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}\) since the dimension of \(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}\) is exactly \(n(n-1)/2\). In practice, we find that \(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}\) is full rank in this special case.

**Remark 2.** The result of Theorem 5 holds for both directed and undirected data when \(R > 1\). In this case, the column in the indicator matrix \(1_{\{i,j\} \cap \{k,l\} \neq \emptyset}\) corresponding to the indices \((i,j,s)\) is the same as that column corresponding to \((i,j,t)\) for all values of \(t \in \{1, \ldots, R\}\). Thus, again \(\hat{\Omega}_{DC}\) is not full rank.

### G Efficient inversion of \(\Omega_E\)

To perform the GEE procedure as described in Section 6, we must invert the exchangeable variance matrix \(\Omega_E\) as defined in Figure 2. For now, we work in the case where \(R = 1\). Since \(\Omega_E\) is a real symmetric matrix, its inverse is real and symmetric as well. However, we can say more about the patterns in the inverse \(\Omega_E^{-1}\). Recall that \(\Omega_E\) has at most six unique terms; call these parameters \(\phi\). We find that the inverse \(\Omega_E^{-1}\) has at most six unique terms as well. If we define the parameters in \(\Omega_E^{-1}\) as \(p\), we can write

\[
\Omega_E(\phi)\Omega_E^{-1}(p) = I \quad \text{for} \quad \phi, p \in \mathbb{R}^6
\]  
(92)
where $I$ is the $n(n-1) \times n(n-1)$ identity. Lastly, we make the conjecture that the parameter pattern in $\Omega^{-1}_E$ is exactly the same as that in $\Omega_E$; we find this conjecture to be true in practice.

One caveat is that the locations in which we assume zeros in $\Omega_E$ are not zero in $\Omega^{-1}_E$ in general.

We can find the inverse parameters $p$ from $\phi$ without inverting the entire matrix $\Omega_E$ by instead solving the following linear system

$$C(\phi, n)p = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0]^T$$

for $C(\phi, n) \in \mathbb{R}^{6 \times 6}$, where $C(\phi, n)$ is a set of six linear equations based on the parameters $\phi$ and the number of actors $n$ and is depicted in Figure 11. Thus, we replace the need to invert the $n(n-1) \times n(n-1)$ matrix $\Omega_E$ by the inversion of the $6 \times 6$ matrix $C(\phi, n)$. Using this procedure, the computational cost associated with finding the inverse of $\Omega_E$ is independent of the number of actors $n$.

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\phi_1 & \phi_2 & (n-2)\phi_3 & (n-2)\phi_4 & 2(n-2)\phi_5 & (n-2)(n-3)\phi_6 \\
\phi_2 & \phi_1 & (n-2)\phi_5 & (n-2)\phi_6 & (n-2)(\phi_3 + \phi_4) & (n-2)(n-3)\phi_6 \\
\phi_3 & \phi_5 & \phi_1 + (n-3)\phi_3 & \phi_5 + (n-3)\phi_6 & \phi_2 + \phi_4 + (n-3)(\phi_5 + \phi_6) & (n-3)(\phi_4 + \phi_5 + (n-4)\phi_6) \\
\phi_4 & \phi_5 & \phi_1 + (n-3)\phi_4 & \phi_2 + \phi_3 + (n-3)(\phi_5 + \phi_6) & (n-3)(\phi_3 + \phi_5 + (n-4)\phi_6) & (n-3)(\phi_3 + \phi_5 + (n-4)\phi_6) \\
\phi_5 & \phi_4 & \phi_2 + (n-3)\phi_6 & \phi_3 + (n-3)\phi_6 & \phi_1 + \phi_5 + (n-3)(\phi_4 + \phi_6) & (n-3)(\phi_3 + \phi_5 + (n-4)\phi_6) \\
\phi_6 & \phi_5 & \phi_4 + \phi_5 + (n-4)\phi_6 & \phi_3 + \phi_5 + (n-4)\phi_6 & \phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5 + 2(n-4)\phi_6 & \phi_1 + \phi_2 + (n-4)(\phi_3 + \phi_4 + 2\phi_5 + (n-5)\phi_6)
\end{bmatrix}$$

Figure 11: Matrix $C(\phi, n)$.

Now consider the case of array data with $R > 1$. Inversion of the exchangeable covariance matrices $\Omega = V[\Xi_v]$ in Figure 6 requires consideration of the patterns in the block matrices. Focusing on Figure 6(a), note that $\Omega_E$ is parametrized by twelve terms. We denote the first six parameters as $\phi^{(1)}$ and the second six $\phi^{(2)}$, corresponding to $\Omega_1$ and $\Omega_2$ respectively. Again the inverse $\Omega^{-1}$ has the exact same block matrix pattern as $\Omega$. Thus, the inverse may be parametrized by $p^{(1)}$ and $p^{(2)}$, each with length six, defined by the following linear
This is twelve linear equations in $p^{(1)}$ and $p^{(2)}$. In this formulation we reduce a $Rn(n - 1) \times Rn(n - 1)$ inversion to a $12 \times 12$ inversion for calculation of $\Omega^{-1}_E$. Again, note that there is no dependence of the complexity of the inversion on the array dimensions $n$ and $R$. The inverses of the other possible exchangeable covariance matrices in Figure 6, while more complex, can be calculated using a similar procedure that again omits dependence on array dimension $n$.

**H   Eigenvalues of $\Omega_E$**

Since the entries in the exchangeable covariance matrix estimator $\hat{\Omega}_E$ are empirical averages, it is possible the estimate is not positive definite. Here we briefly investigate the constraints on the parameters that guarantee the resulting covariance matrix is positive definite for $R = 1$. Note that for computing the sandwich estimator variance of $\hat{\beta}$ and making inference on $\hat{\beta}$, positive definiteness of $\hat{\Omega}_E$ is not necessary. However, if a GEE procedure is employed, the inverse of the covariance matrix estimator is required, and hence positive definiteness of $\hat{\Omega}_E$ is desired.

**H.1   Undirected relational data**

We focus first on the undirected case, where the exchangeable covariance matrix contains two distinct nonzero entries: a variance $\sigma^2$ and a parameter $\phi$ in the off-diagonal representing the correlation between any pairs of relations that share an actor. Below we consider the correlation matrix, rather than the covariance matrix, which contains only nonzero correlation
value. We denote this value by $a$, and note that $a = \phi/\sigma^2$.

Based on a thorough empirical investigation, we conjecture that the exchangeable correlation matrix corresponding to an undirected set of relations among $n$ actors, which has nonzero value $a$ in select off-diagonal entries, has exactly three eigenvalues as given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Multiplicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 + 2(n - 2)a$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - 2a$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}n(n - 3)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 + (n - 4)a$</td>
<td>$n - 1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation matrix is positive definite if and only if all eigenvalues are positive. Thus, if $a \in \left(\frac{-1}{2(n-2)}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, the correlation matrix is positive definite. Notice that the upper bound on $a$ does not vary with $n$. Using the relation between $a$ and $\{\sigma^2, \phi\}$, this constraint can be re-expressed as a constraint on the covariance parameters.

### H.2 Directed networks

We find empirically that the directed covariance matrix $\Omega_E$ has five unique eigenvalues. Further, each of the eigenvalues are contained within the set of six eigenvalues of the matrix $C$, introduced in Appendix D and used in computation of the inverse of the exchangeable covariance matrix. As $C$ is a bilinear function of $\Omega_E$, this observation does not appear implausible. We may construct $C = A^T \Omega_E B$ for $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1) \times 6}$ and $A^T B = I$. One such pair is $B$ taken to be the first column of $S_1$ thought $S_6$ and $A$ taken to be all zeros except for a single 1 in each column occupying rows $\{1, n, 2n, 2, n + 1, n(n - 1)\}$, respectively.

In analyzing the eigenvalues of the directed covariance matrix $\Omega_E$, we again focus on the exchangeable correlation matrix which contains four nonzero off-diagonal elements $\{a,b,c,d\}$ corresponding, respectively, in placement to $\{\phi_a, \phi_b, \phi_c, \phi_d\}$ in the exchange covariance matrix $\Omega_E$. Note $a = \phi_a/\sigma^2$, $b = \phi_b/\sigma^2$, and so on. Based on an eigenvalue analysis of $C$ and various empirical studies, we conjecture the eigenvalues for the exchangeable correlation matrix.
matrix associated with a directed set of relations among \( n \) actors has exactly five eigenvalues as given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue(s)</th>
<th>Multiplicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 1 + a + (n - 2)(b + c) + 2(n - 2)d )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1 + a - (b + c + 2d) )</td>
<td>( (n - 1)(n - 2)/2 - 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1 - (a + b + c) + 2d )</td>
<td>( (n - 1)(n - 2)/2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ((n - 3)(b + c) - 2d + 2)/2 \pm \sqrt{(\alpha + \beta)/2} )</td>
<td>( n - 1 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where \( \alpha = (c^2 + b^2)(n^2 - 2n + 1) + 4d^2(n^2 - 6n + 9) + 2bc(1 - n^2 + 2n) \) and \( \beta = ad(8n - 24) + (b + c)d(12 - 4n) + 4a(a - (b + c)). \) As in the undirected case, these constraints can be re-expressed as constraints on the original five covariance parameters.