

PROFILE ESTIMATION FOR PARTIAL FUNCTIONAL PARTIALLY LINEAR SINGLE-INDEX MODEL*

BY QINGGUO TANG^{†,||}, LINGLONG KONG^{‡,**}, DAVID
RUPPERT^{§,††}, AND ROHANA J. KARUNAMUNI^{¶,**}

*Nanjing University of Science and Technology^{||}, University of Alberta^{**}
and Cornell University^{††}*

This paper studies a *partial functional partially linear single-index model* that consists of a functional linear component as well as a linear single-index component. This model generalizes many well-known existing models and is suitable for more complicated data structures. However, its estimation inherits the difficulties and complexities from both components and makes it a challenging problem, which calls for new methodology. We propose a novel profile B-spline method to estimate the parameters by approximating the unknown nonparametric link function in the single-index component part with B-spline, while the linear slope function in the functional component part is estimated by the functional principal component basis. The consistency and asymptotic normality of the parametric estimators are derived, and the global convergence of the proposed estimator of the linear slope function is also established. More excitingly, the latter convergence is optimal in the minimax sense. A two-stage procedure is implemented to estimate the nonparametric link function, and the resulting estimator possesses the optimal global rate of convergence. Furthermore, the convergence rate of the mean squared

*Part of the data used in preparation of this article were obtained from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.ucla.edu). As such, the investigators within the ADNI contributed to the design and implementation of ADNI and/or provided data but did not participate in analysis or writing of this report. A complete listing of ADNI investigators can be found at: http://adni.loni.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/how_to_protect_to_protect_apply/ADNI_protect_Acknowledgement_protect_List.pdf

[†]Supported by the National Social Science Foundation of China (16BTJ019) and Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province of China (Grant No. BK20151481).

[‡]Supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) and the Canadian Statistical Sciences Institute Collaborative Research Team (CANSSI-CRT).

[§]Supported by NSF grant AST-1312903 and NIH grants P30 AG010129, K01 AG030514.

[¶]Supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62G08, 62G05; secondary 62G20

Keywords and phrases: Functional data analysis, Single-index model, Principal component analysis, Profile B-spline estimation, Consistency, Asymptotic normality.

prediction error for a predictor is also obtained. Empirical properties of the proposed procedures are studied through Monte Carlo simulations. A real data example is also analyzed to illustrate the power and flexibility of the proposed methodology.

1. Introduction. Functional data analysis has generated increasing interest in recent years in many areas, including biology, chemometrics, econometrics, geophysics, medical sciences, meteorology, etc. Functional data are made up of repeated measurements taken as curves, surfaces or other objects varying over a continuum, such as the time and space. In many experiments, such as clinical diagnosis of neurological diseases from the brain imaging data, functional data appear as the basic unit of observations. As a natural extension of the multivariate data analysis, functional data analysis provides valuable insights into these experiments, taking into account the underlying smoothness of high-dimensional covariates and provides new approaches for solving inference problems. One may refer to the monographs of Ramsay and Silverman [24, 25], Ferraty and Vieu [9] and Horváth and Kokoszka [11] for a general overview on functional data analysis.

Motivated by more complicated data structures, which appeal to more comprehensive, flexible and adaptable models, in this paper we investigate the following *partial functional partially linear single-index model*:

$$(1.1) \quad Y = \int_{\mathcal{T}} a(t)X(t)dt + W^T\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + g(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + \varepsilon,$$

where $X(t)$ is a random function defined on some bounded interval $\mathcal{T}$, $a(t)$ is an unknown square integrable slope function on $\mathcal{T}$, W is a $q \times 1$ vector of covariates, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0$ is a $q \times 1$ unknown coefficient vectors, $Z \in R^d$ is a $d \times 1$ vector of covariates, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ is a $d \times 1$ coefficient vector to be estimated, g is an unknown link function and ε is a random error with mean zero that is independent of the covariates $(X(t), W, Z)$.

Model (1.1) is more flexible and can deal with more complicated data structures. To the best of our knowledge, this model has not been fully studied in the literature yet. It consists of a functional linear component as well as a linear single-index component. This model generalizes many well-known existing models and is suitable for more complicated data structures. However, its estimation inherits some difficulties and complexities from both components and makes it a challenging problem, which calls for new methodology. We propose a novel profile B-spline method to estimate the parameters by approximating the unknown nonparametric link function in the single-index component part with B-spline, while the linear slope

function in the functional component part is estimated by the functional principal component basis.

More specially, model (1.1) can be interpreted from two perspectives. First, it generalizes the partial functional linear models

$$(1.2) \quad Y = \int_{\mathcal{T}} a(t)X(t)dt + W^T\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + \varepsilon,$$

by adding a nonparametric component, $g(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$, with an unknown univariate link function g . This single-index term reduces the dimensionality from the multivariate predictors to a univariate index $Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ and avoids the curse of dimensionality, while still capturing important features in high-dimensional data. Furthermore, since a nonlinear link function g is applied to the index $Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$, interactions between the covariates Z can be modeled. The standard functional linear model [5, 3, 10] with scalar response Y has the same form as model (1.2) without the linear part. In general, $X(t)$ can be a multivariate functional variable, but here we shall only focus on the univariate case. The main interest is estimation of functional coefficient $a(t)$ based on a sample $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ generated from model (1.2). There are number of articles in the literature discussing the slope estimation in model (1.2) using methods such as the penalized spline method [5], the functional principal component analysis [36, 3, 10, 39] and the functional partial least squares method [8], among others.

Second, model (1.1) can be considered as a generalization of the partially linear single-index model [4, 38],

$$(1.3) \quad Y = g(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + W^T\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + \varepsilon,$$

with an addition of functional covariates $X(t)$. The partially linear single-index model (1.3) was first explored by Carroll et al. [4]. In fact, the authors considered a more generalized version, where a known link function is employed in the regression function, while model (1.3) assumes an identity link function. Model (1.3) has also been studied by many other authors, including Xia et al. [35] Xia and Härdle [34], Liang et al. [16] and Wang et al. [33] to name a few.

To tackle the challenging estimation problem, our innovation is to propose a *profile B-spline* (PBS) method to estimate the unknown parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0^T, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T)^T$ by employing a B-spline function to approximate the unknown link function g and using the functional principal component analysis (FPCA) to estimate the slope function $a(t)$. Under some regularity conditions, we prove the consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed

estimators. We also establish a global rate of convergence of the estimator of $a(t)$, and it is shown to be optimal in the minimax sense of Hall and Horowitz [10]. Based on the estimators of parameters, another B-spline function is employed to approximate the function g and then the optimal global convergence rate of the approximation is established. We also obtain convergence rates of the mean squared prediction error for a predictor. For model (1.3), Yu and Ruppert [38] studied asymptotic properties of their estimators of $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0^T, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T)^T$ under the condition that the link function g falls in a finite-dimensional spline space. We note here that the asymptotic properties of all our estimators are derived under the assumption that g can be well approximated by spline functions with increasing the number of knots.

To gain more flexibility and partly motivated by applications, a number of other models based on the standard functional linear model have been studied in the literature, including the partial functional linear regression model (1.2) [26, 27, 30], a generalized functional linear model [20, 7], single and multiple index functional regression models [6, 19] and a functional partial linear single-index model [32] among others.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the proposed profile estimation method. Section 3 presents asymptotic results of our estimator. In Section 4, we conduct simulation studies to examine the finite sample performance of the proposed procedures. In Section 5, the proposed method is illustrated by analyzing a diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) data set from the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.ucla.edu). Finally, Section 6 contains some concluding remarks. All proofs are relegated to the Appendix.

2. Profile B-spline estimation. Let Y be a real-valued response variable and $\{X(t) : t \in \mathcal{T}\}$ be a mean zero second-order (i.e., $EX(t)^2 < \infty$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$) stochastic process with sample paths in $L_2(\mathcal{T})$, the set of all square integrable functions on $\mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{T}$ is a bounded closed interval. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denote the $L_2(\mathcal{T})$ inner product and norm, respectively. Denote the covariance function of the process $X(t)$ by $K(s, t) = \text{cov}(X(s), X(t))$. We suppose that $K(s, t)$ is positive definite. Then $K(s, t)$ admits a spectral decomposition in terms of strictly positive eigenvalues λ_j :

$$(2.1) \quad K(s, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \phi_j(s) \phi_j(t), \quad s, t \in \mathcal{T},$$

where λ_j and ϕ_j are eigenvalue and eigenfunction pairs of the linear operator with kernel K , the eigenvalues are ordered so that $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots > 0$ and eigenfunctions $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots$ form an orthonormal basis for $L_2(\mathcal{T})$. This

leads to the Karhunen-Loève representation $X(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \xi_j \phi_j(t)$, where $\xi_j = \int_{\mathcal{T}} X(t) \phi_j(t) dt$ are uncorrelated random variables with mean zero and variance $E\xi_j^2 = \lambda_j$. Let $a(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \phi_j(t)$. Then model (1.1) can be written as

$$(2.2) \quad Y = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \xi_j + W^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + g(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + \varepsilon.$$

By (2.2), we have

$$(2.3) \quad a_j = E\{[Y - (W^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + g(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))]\xi_j\}/\lambda_j.$$

Let $(X_i(t), W_i, Z_i, Y_i), i = 1, \dots, n$, be independent realizations generated from model (1.1). Then the empirical versions of K and of its spectral decomposition are

$$(2.4) \quad \hat{K}(s, t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i(s) X_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{\lambda}_j \hat{\phi}_j(s) \hat{\phi}_j(t), \quad s, t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Analogously to the case of K , $(\hat{\lambda}_j, \hat{\phi}_j)$ are (eigenvalue, eigenfunction) pairs for the linear operator with kernel $\hat{K}$, ordered such that $\hat{\lambda}_1 \geq \hat{\lambda}_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$. We take $(\hat{\lambda}_j, \hat{\phi}_j)$ and $\hat{\xi}_{ij} = \langle X_i, \hat{\phi}_j \rangle$ to be the estimators of (λ_j, ϕ_j) and ξ_{ij} , respectively, and take

$$(2.5) \quad \tilde{a}_j = \frac{1}{n \hat{\lambda}_j} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - (W_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 + g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))] \hat{\xi}_{ij}$$

to be the estimator of a_j .

In order to estimate g , we adapt spline approximations. We assume that $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\| = 1$ and that the last element β_{0d} of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ is positive, to ensure identifiability. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{d-1})^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d} = (\beta_{01}, \dots, \beta_{0(d-1)})^T$. Since $\beta_{0d} = \sqrt{1 - (\beta_{01}^2 + \dots + \beta_{0(d-1)}^2)} > 0$, there exists a constant $\rho_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \Theta_{\rho_0} = \{\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d)^T : \beta_d = \sqrt{1 - (\beta_1^2 + \dots + \beta_{d-1}^2)} \geq \rho_0\}$. Suppose that the distribution of Z has a compact support set $\mathcal{D}$. Denote $U_* = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $U^* = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$. We first split the interval $[U_*, U^*]$ into k_n subintervals with knots $\{U_* = u_{n0} < u_{n1} < \dots < u_{nk_n} = U^*\}$. For fixed $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, suppose $u_{n(l-1)} < \inf_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq u_{nl} < u_{n(l+k_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} \leq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta} < u_{n(l+k_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}+1)}$. Let $U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = u_{nl}$ and $U^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = u_{n(l+k_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}$. For any fixed integer $s \geq 1$, let $S_{k_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}^s(u)$ be the set of spline functions of degree s with knots $\{U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = u_{nl} < u_{n(l+1)} < \dots < u_{n(l+k_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})} = U^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}$; that is, a function $f(u)$ belongs

to $S_{k_\beta}^s(u)$ if and only if $f(u)$ belongs to $C^{s-1}[u_{nl}, u_{n(l+k_\beta)}]$ and its restriction to each $[u_{nk}, u_{n(k+1)})$ is a polynomial of degree at most s . Put

(2.6)

$$B_{k\beta}(u) = (\tilde{u}_{nk} - \tilde{u}_{n(k-s-1)})[\tilde{u}_{n(k-s-1)}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{nk}](w - u)_+^s, \quad k = 1, \dots, K_\beta,$$

where $K_\beta = k_\beta + s$, $[\tilde{u}_{n(k-s-1)}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{nk}]f$ denotes the $(s+1)$ th-order divided difference of the function f , $\tilde{u}_{nk} = u_{nl}$ for $k = -s, \dots, -1$, $\tilde{u}_{nk} = u_{n(l+k)}$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, k_\beta$, and $\tilde{u}_{nk} = u_{nk_\beta}$ for $k = k_\beta + 1, \dots, K_n$. Then $\{B_{k\beta}(u)\}_{k=1}^{K_\beta}$ form a basis for $S_{k_\beta}^s(u)$.

For fixed α and β , we use $\sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{a}_j \hat{\xi}_j$ to approximate $\sum_{j=1}^\infty a_j \xi_j$ in (2.2) and use $\sum_{k=1}^{K_\beta} b_k B_{k\beta}(u)$ to approximate $g(u)$ for $u \in [U_\beta, U^\beta]$. We then estimate $g(\cdot)$ by minimizing

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\hat{\xi}_{ij}}{n\hat{\lambda}_j} \sum_{l=1}^n \left[Y_l - W_l^T \alpha - \sum_{k=1}^{K_\beta} b_k B_{k\beta}(Z_l^T \beta) \right] \hat{\xi}_{lj} - \right. \\ \left. W_i^T \alpha - \sum_{k=1}^{K_\beta} b_k B_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) \right\}^2$$

with respect to $b_1, \dots, b_{K_\beta}$, where m is a smoothing parameter which denotes a frequency cut-off. Define $\tilde{\xi}_{il} = \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\xi}_{ij} \hat{\xi}_{lj} / \hat{\lambda}_j$, $\tilde{Y}_i = Y_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l \tilde{\xi}_{il}$, $\tilde{W}_i = W_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n W_l \tilde{\xi}_{il}$ and $\tilde{B}_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) = B_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_l^T \beta) \tilde{\xi}_{il}$. Then (2.7) can be written as

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \tilde{Y}_i - \tilde{W}_i^T \alpha - \sum_{k=1}^{K_\beta} b_k \tilde{B}_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) \right\}^2.$$

Denote $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_\beta(Z_i^T \beta) = (\tilde{B}_{1\beta}(Z_i^T \beta), \dots, \tilde{B}_{K_\beta\beta}(Z_i^T \beta))^T$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta) = (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_\beta(Z_1^T \beta), \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_\beta(Z_n^T \beta))^T$, $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} = (\tilde{Y}_1, \dots, \tilde{Y}_n)^T$, $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = (\tilde{W}_1, \dots, \tilde{W}_n)^T$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_{K_\beta})^T$. If $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta)$ is invertible, then the estimator

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha, \beta) = (\tilde{b}_1(\alpha, \beta), \dots, \tilde{b}_{K_\beta}(\alpha, \beta))^T$$

of $\mathbf{b}$ is given by

$$(2.9) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha, \beta) = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta) \right\}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta) (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \alpha).$$

We solve the following minimization problem

$$(2.10) \quad \min_{\alpha, \beta} \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \alpha - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta) \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha, \beta) \right\}^T \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \alpha - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta) \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha, \beta) \right\}$$

to obtain the estimators $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$. A Newton-Raphson algorithm can be applied for the minimization. An estimator of $\mathbf{b}$ is obtained by solving the following minimization problem

$$(2.11) \quad \hat{\mathbf{b}} = \min_{\mathbf{b}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \tilde{Y}_i - \tilde{W}_i^T \hat{\alpha} - \mathbf{b}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\hat{\beta}}(Z_i^T \hat{\beta}) \right\}^2,$$

and then $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ is given by

$$(2.12) \quad \hat{\mathbf{b}} = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\hat{\beta}) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\beta}) \right\}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\hat{\beta}) (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \hat{\alpha}).$$

Let $\tilde{g}(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_{\hat{\beta}}} \hat{b}_k B_{k\hat{\beta}}(u)$ for $u \in [U_{\hat{\beta}}, U^{\hat{\beta}}]$. We then choose a new tuning parameter $\tilde{m}$ and an estimator of $a(t)$ given by $\hat{a}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \hat{a}_j \phi_j(t)$ with

$$(2.13) \quad \hat{a}_j = \frac{1}{n\hat{\lambda}_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - W_i^T \hat{\alpha} - \tilde{g}(Z_i^T \hat{\beta}) \right\} \hat{\xi}_{ij}.$$

In order to construct an estimator of g that achieves the optimal rate of convergence, we select new knots and new B-spline basis based on the estimators $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$. Let $\{U_{\hat{\beta}} = \bar{u}_{n0} < \bar{u}_{n1} < \dots < \bar{u}_{nK_n^*} = U^{\hat{\beta}}\}$ be new knots and $\{B_k^*(u)\}_{k=1}^{K_n^*}$ be a new basis, where $K_n^* = k_n^* + s$. Then $B_{k\hat{\beta}}^*(Z_i^T \hat{\beta})$, $\mathbf{B}_{\hat{\beta}}^*(Z_i^T \hat{\beta})$ and $\mathbf{B}^*(\hat{\beta})$ are defined similarly as $\tilde{B}_{k\hat{\beta}}(Z_i^T \hat{\beta})$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\hat{\beta}}(Z_i^T \hat{\beta})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\beta})$, respectively. We then solve the following minimization problem

$$(2.14) \quad \min_{\mathbf{b}^*} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \tilde{Y}_i - \tilde{W}_i^T \hat{\alpha} - \mathbf{b}^{*T} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\beta}}^*(Z_i^T \hat{\beta}) \right\}^2,$$

to obtain an estimator of $\mathbf{b}^*$, where $\mathbf{b}^* = (b_1, \dots, b_{K_n^*})^T$. If $\mathbf{B}^{*T}(\hat{\beta}) \mathbf{B}^*(\hat{\beta})$ is invertible, then an estimator of $\mathbf{b}^*$ is given by

$$(2.15) \quad \hat{\mathbf{b}}^* = \mathbf{b}^*(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) = \left\{ \mathbf{B}^{*T}(\hat{\beta}) \mathbf{B}^*(\hat{\beta}) \right\}^{-1} \mathbf{B}^{*T}(\hat{\beta}) (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \hat{\alpha}).$$

The second stage estimator of $g(u)$ is then equal to $\hat{g}(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_n^*} \hat{b}_k^* B_k^*(u)$ for $u \in [U_{\hat{\beta}}, U^{\hat{\beta}}]$.

To implement our estimation method, some appropriate values for m , $\tilde{m}$, k_n and K_n^* are necessary. From our simulation in Section 4 below, we observe that the parametric estimators $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ are not sensitive to the choices of m and k_n , they can be chosen subjectively. In the simulation in Section 4, we also choose $h_0 = n^{-1/(2s-1)}$ with $s = 3$, where s is defined in Assumption

4 in Section 3 below. The value for tuning parameter $\tilde{m}$ can be selected by information criteria BIC, which is given by

$$BIC(\tilde{m}) = \log \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(Y_i - W_i \hat{\alpha} - \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \hat{a}_j \hat{\xi}_{ij} - \tilde{g}(Z_i^T \hat{\beta}) \right)^2 \right\} + \frac{\log(n) \tilde{m}}{n}.$$

Large values of BIC indicate either poor fidelity to the data or overfitting because $\tilde{m}$ is too large. A value for K_n^* can also be selected by the following BIC information criteria:

$$BIC(K_n^*) = \log \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tilde{Y}_i - \tilde{W}_i \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}^{*T} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\beta}}^*(Z_i^T \hat{\beta}) \right)^2 \right\} + \frac{\log(n) K_n^*}{n}.$$

In practice, the proposed estimation method is implemented using the following steps:

Step 1. Choose an m and fit a partial functional linear model; that is, solve the minimization problem (2.8) with the link function g replaced by a linear function to obtain initial values $\hat{\alpha}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{\beta}_1^{(0)}$. Then set $\hat{\beta}^{(0)} = \hat{\beta}_1^{(0)} / \|\hat{\beta}_1^{(0)}\|$, and multiply it by -1 if necessary.

Step 2. Construct the B-spline basis $\{B_{k\hat{\beta}^{(0)}}(u)\}_{k=1}^{K_{\hat{\beta}^{(0)}}}$ based on the computed $U_{\hat{\beta}^{(0)}}$ and $U^{\hat{\beta}^{(0)}}$. Then obtain $\tilde{b}(\hat{\alpha}^{(0)}, \hat{\beta}^{(0)})$ from (2.9) and solve the minimizing problem (2.10) to obtain the estimators $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$.

Step 3. Compute $\hat{b}$ and $\hat{a}_j$ from (2.12) and (2.13), respectively, and obtain the estimator $\hat{a}(t)$.

Step 4. Compute $U_{\hat{\beta}}$ and $U^{\hat{\beta}}$, and construct the basis $\{B_k^*(u)\}_{k=1}^{K_n^*}$. Then obtain the estimator $\hat{\mathbf{b}}^*$ from (2.15) and obtain the estimator $\hat{g}(u)$.

Remark 2.1. In practical applications, $X(t)$ is only discretely observed. Without loss of generality, suppose for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $X_i(t)$ is observed at n_i discrete points $0 = t_{i1} < \dots < t_{in_i} = 1$. Then linear interpolation functions or spline interpolation functions can be used for the estimators of $X_i(t)$.

Remark 2.2 Though the basis function $B_{k\beta}(u)$ depends on β , we see from (2.6) that the total number of all the different $B_{k\beta}(u)$ is not more than $(s+1)k_n$. In certain practical applications where the sample size n is not large enough and h_0 is not small enough, one can choose $U_{\beta} = \inf_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \beta$ and $U^{\beta} = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \beta$ and construct the basis $\{B_{k\beta}(u)\}_{k=1}^{K_{\beta}}$ with knots $\{U_{\beta} < u_{n(l+1)} < \dots < u_{n(l+k_{\beta}-1)} < U^{\beta}\}$ to make full use of the data. That is, the

intervals $[u_{nl}, u_{n(l+1)}]$ and $[u_{n(l+k_\beta-1)}, u_{n(l+k_\beta)}]$ are replaced by $[U_\beta, u_{n(l+1)}]$ and $[u_{n(l+k_\beta-1)}, U^\beta]$, respectively.

3. Asymptotic properties. In this section we establish the asymptotic normality and convergence rates of the estimators proposed in the previous section. Before stating main results, we first state a few assumptions that are necessary to prove the theoretical results.

Assumption 1. $E(Y^4) < +\infty$ and $\int_{\mathcal{T}} E(X^4(t))dt < \infty$. $E(\xi_j|Z^T\beta) = 0$ and $E(\xi_i\xi_j|Z^T\beta) = 0$ for $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots$; and $\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}$. For each $j \geq 1$, $E(\xi_j^{2r}|Z^T\beta) \leq C_1\lambda_j^r$ for $r = 1, 2$, where $C_1 > 0$ is a constant. For any sequence $j_1, \dots, j_4$, $E(\xi_{j_1} \dots \xi_{j_4}|Z^T\beta) = 0$ unless each index j_k is repeated.

Assumption 2. There exists a convex function φ defined on the interval $[0, 1]$ such that $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\lambda_j = \varphi(1/j)$ for $j \geq 1$.

Assumption 3. For Fourier coefficients a_j , there exist constants $C_2 > 0$ and $\gamma > 3/2$ such that $|a_j| \leq C_2j^{-\gamma}$ for all $j \geq 1$.

Assumption 4. The function $g(u)$ is a s -times continuously differentiable function such that $|g^{(s)}(u') - g^{(s)}(u)| \leq C_3|u' - u|^\varsigma$, for $U_* \leq u', u \leq U^*$ and $p = s + \varsigma > 3$, with constants $0 < \varsigma \leq 1$ and $C_3 > 0$. The knots $\{U_* = u_{n0} < u_{n1} < \dots < u_{nk_n} = U^*\}$ satisfy that $h_0/\min_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} h_{nk} \leq C_4$, where $h_{nk} = u_{nk} - u_{n(k-1)}$, $h_0 = \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} h_{nk}$ and $C_4 > 0$ is a constant.

Assumption 5. $nh_0^{2p} \rightarrow 0$, $n^{-1/2}m\lambda_m^{-1} \rightarrow 0$, $n^{-1}m^4\lambda_m^{-1}h_0^{-6} \log m \rightarrow 0$ and $m^{-2\gamma}h_0^{-2} \rightarrow 0$.

Assumption 5'. $m \rightarrow \infty$, $h_0 \rightarrow 0$, $n^{-1/2}m\lambda_m^{-1} \rightarrow 0$, $n^{-1}m^4\lambda_m^{-1}h_0^{-2} \log m \rightarrow 0$ and $(nh_0^3)^{-1}(\log n)^2 \rightarrow 0$.

Assumption 6. The distribution of Z has a compact support set $\mathcal{D}$. The marginal density function $f_\beta(u)$ of $Z^T\beta$ is bounded away from zero and infinity for $u \in [U_\beta, U^\beta]$ and satisfies that $0 < c_1 \leq f_\beta(u) \leq C_5 < +\infty$ for β in a small neighborhood of β_0 and $u \in [U_{\beta_0}, U^{\beta_0}]$, where c_1 and C_5 are two positive constants.

Assumption 7. $W = (W_1, \dots, W_q)^T$, $W_r = \check{W}_r + V_r$, $\check{W}_r = \sum_{j=1}^\infty w_{rj}\xi_j$ and $|w_{rj}| \leq C_6j^{-\gamma}$ for all $j \geq 1$ and $r = 1, \dots, q$, where $C_6 > 0$ is a constant. $V = (V_1, V_2, \dots, V_q)^T$ is independent of $\{\xi_j, j = 1, \dots\}$ and $E(\|V\|^4) < +\infty$.

Under Assumption 4, according to Corollary 6.21 of Schumaker (1981, p.227), there exists a spline function $g_0(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_{\beta_0}} b_{0k}B_{k\beta_0}(u)$ and a constant $C_7 > 0$ such that, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, s$,

$$(3.1) \quad \sup_{u \in [U_{\beta_0}, U^{\beta_0}]} |R^{(k)}(u)| \leq C_7 h_0^{p-k}$$

where $R(u) = g(u) - g_0(u)$. Let $\mathbf{B}_\beta(u) = (B_{1\beta}(u), \dots, B_{K_\beta\beta}(u))^T$ and $\mathbf{b}_0 =$

$(b_{01}, \dots, b_{0K_{\beta_0}})^T$. Define

$$(3.2) \quad G(\alpha, \beta) = \{(\alpha - \alpha_0)^T E(VV^T) - 2\mathbf{b}_0^T E[\mathbf{B}_{\beta_0}(Z^T \beta_0)V^T]\}(\alpha - \alpha_0) + \mathbf{b}_0^T \Gamma(\beta_0, \beta_0) \mathbf{b}_0 - \Pi^T(\alpha, \beta) \Gamma^{-1}(\beta, \beta) \Pi(\alpha, \beta) + \sigma^2,$$

where $\Gamma(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (\gamma_{kk'}(\beta_1, \beta_2))_{K_{\beta_1} \times K_{\beta_2}}$ with $\gamma_{kk'}(\beta_1, \beta_2) = E[B_{k\beta_1}(Z^T \beta_1) B_{k'\beta_2}(Z^T \beta_2)]$ and $\Pi(\alpha, \beta) = \Gamma(\beta, \beta_0) \mathbf{b}_0 - E[\mathbf{B}_{\beta}(Z^T \beta)V^T](\alpha - \alpha_0)$. Put $\theta = (\alpha^T, \beta^T)^T$, $\theta_{-d} = (\alpha^T, \beta_{-d}^T)^T$, $\hat{\theta}_{-d} = (\hat{\alpha}^T, \hat{\beta}_{-d}^T)^T$ and $\theta_{0,-d} = (\alpha_0^T, \beta_{0,-d}^T)^T$. Define

$$G^*(\theta_{-d}) = G^*(\alpha, \beta_{-d}) = G(\alpha, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{d-1}, \sqrt{1 - \|\beta_{-d}\|^2})$$

and its Hessian matrix $H^*(\theta_{-d}) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_{-d} \partial \theta_{-d}^T} G^*(\theta_{-d})$.

Assumption 8. $G^*(\theta_{-d})$ is locally convex at $\theta_{0,-d}$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\|\theta_{-d} - \theta_{0,-d}\| < \varepsilon$ holds whenever $|G^*(\theta_{-d}) - G^*(\theta_{0,-d})| < \epsilon$. Furthermore, the Hessian matrix $H^*(\theta_{-d})$ is continuous in some neighborhood of $\theta_{0,-d}$ and $H^*(\theta_{0,-d}) > 0$.

Assumption 9. The knots $\{U_{\hat{\beta}} = \bar{u}_{n0} < \bar{u}_{n1} < \dots < \bar{u}_{n\bar{k}_n} = U^{\hat{\beta}}\}$ satisfy that $h / \min_{1 \leq k \leq \bar{k}_n} \bar{h}_{nk} \leq C_8$, where $\bar{h}_{nk} = \bar{u}_{nk} - \bar{u}_{n(k-1)}$, $h = \max_{1 \leq k \leq \bar{k}_n} \bar{h}_{nk}$ and $C_8 > 0$ is a constant. Further, $h \rightarrow 0$ and $n^{-1} m^4 \lambda_m^{-1} h^{-4} \log m \rightarrow 0$.

Assumptions 1 and 3 are standard conditions for functional linear models; see, e.g., Cai and Hall [3] and Hall and Horowitz [10]. Assumption 2 is slightly less restrictive than (3.2) of Hall and Horowitz [10]. The quantity p in Assumption 4 is the order of smoothness of the function $g(u)$. Assumptions 5 and 5' can be easily verified and will be further discussed below. Assumption 6 ensures the existence and uniqueness of the spline estimator of the function $g(u)$. If the marginal density $f_{\beta}(u)$ of $Z^T \beta$ is uniformly continuous for β in some neighborhood of β_0 , then the second part of Assumption 6 is easily satisfied by modifying the knots. Assumption 8 ensures the existence and uniqueness of the estimator of $\theta_{0,-d}$ in a neighborhood of $\theta_{0,-d}$.

Remark 3.1. If $\lambda_j \sim j^{-\delta}$, $m \sim n^{\iota}$ and $h_0 \sim n^{-\tau}$, then Assumption 5 holds when $\iota < \min(1/(2(1+\delta)), 1/(\delta+4))$ and $1/(2p) < \tau < (1-\iota(\delta+4))/6$, where $\delta > 1$, $\iota > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ are constants and the notation $a_n \sim b_n$ means that the ratio a_n/b_n is bounded away from zero and infinity.

The next theorem gives the consistency and convergence rate of the estimators of α_0 and $\beta_{0,-d}$.

Theorem 3.1. (i) Suppose that Assumptions 1 to 4, 5', 6 and 7 hold, and that $G^*(\theta_{-d})$ is locally convex at $\theta_{0,-d}$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(3.3) \quad \hat{\alpha} \xrightarrow{P} \alpha_0, \quad \hat{\beta}_{-d} \xrightarrow{P} \beta_{0,-d},$$

where $\xrightarrow{P}$ means convergence in probability.

(ii) Suppose that Assumptions 1 to 8 hold. Then

$$(3.4) \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 = o_p(h_0), \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d} = o_p(h_0).$$

In order to establish the asymptotic distributions of the estimators $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}$, we first introduce some notation. Define

$$(3.5) \quad G_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \tilde{Y}_i - \tilde{W}_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \sum_{k=1}^{K_\beta} \tilde{b}_k(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \tilde{B}_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\}^2.$$

If $u_{n(l-1)} < \inf_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 < u_{nl}$, then by (3.4) we have $U_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}} = U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0} = u_{nl}$ for sufficiently large n . If $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = u_{nl}$, then we modify u_{nl} such that $\inf_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 < u_{nl}$, and also we then have $U_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}} = U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0} = u_{nl}$. Similarly, if $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = u_{n(l+k_\beta)}$, then we modify $u_{n(l+k_\beta)}$ such that $u_{n(l+k_\beta)} < \sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}} z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$, and then we have $U^{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}} = U^{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0} = u_{n(l+k_\beta)}$. Therefore, if necessary, we first modify the knots $\{u_{nk}\}_{k=0}^{K_n}$, so that there exists a neighborhood $\delta^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}; r^*)$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}$ such that $U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = U_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}$, $U^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = U^{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}$ for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \delta^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}; r^*)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \delta^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}; r^*)$ for sufficiently large n . Let $K_n = K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}$, $B_k(u) = B_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}(u)$ and $\tilde{B}_k(u) = \tilde{B}_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}(u)$. For $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \delta^*(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}; r^*)$, we have $K_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = K_n$, $B_k(u) = B_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u)$ and $\tilde{B}_k(u) = \tilde{B}_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u)$. Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \tilde{Y}_i - \tilde{W}_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \tilde{b}_k(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \tilde{B}_k(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\}^T \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$G_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b}) = G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) \mathbf{b} \right\}^T \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) \mathbf{b} \right\},$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{d-1}, \sqrt{1 - (\beta_1^2 + \dots + \beta_{d-1}^2)}).$$

Since $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is the minimizer of $G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, then $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}, \hat{\mathbf{b}})$ is the minimizer of $G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b})$, where $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{-d}) = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}) = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}) \right\}^{-1} (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}) (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$. Hence,

$$(3.6) \quad \left. \frac{\partial G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}} \right|_{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b}) = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}, \hat{\mathbf{b}})} = - \frac{2}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}) \hat{\mathbf{b}} \right\} = 0$$

for $r = 1, \dots, d-1$, where $\dot{\tilde{B}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_r}$. Set $\dot{G}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b}) = \frac{\partial G_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}} = (\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}} G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b})^T, \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}} G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}, \mathbf{b})^T)^T$. Then from (3.6) and (3.7) and using a Taylor expansion, we obtain

where $\ddot{G}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d})) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}} \dot{G}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}))$ is a $(q+d-1) \times (q+d-1)$ matrix and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}^*$ is between $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{-d}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,-d}$. Let $\Omega_0 = (\varpi_{kr})_{(q+d-1) \times (q+d-1)}$ with

$$\varpi_{(q+r)k} = \varpi_{k(q+r)} \text{ for } k, = 1, \dots, q; r = 1, \dots, d-1, \text{ and}$$

for $k, r = 1, \dots, d-1$, where $\mathbf{B}(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) = (B_1(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}), \dots, B_{K_n}(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}))^T$, and $\dot{\mathbf{B}}_r(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{B}_r(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \beta_r}$, $H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}')$ and $R_{rk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}')$ are $K_n \times K_n$ matrices whose (l, l') th elements are $E[B_l(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta})\dot{B}_{l'r}(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}')]$ and $E[\dot{B}_{lr}(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta})\dot{B}_{l'k}(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}')]$, respectively, and $\dot{B}_{lr}(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\partial B_l(Z^T\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \beta_r}$.

$$(3.9) \quad \sqrt{n}\Omega_0^{1/2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{-d} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,-d}) \rightarrow_d N(0, \sigma^2 I_{q+d-1}),$$

where I_{q+d-1} is the $(q+d-1) \times (q+d-1)$ identity matrix.

Next we establish the convergence rates of the estimators $\hat{a}(t)$ and $\hat{g}(u)$.

Theorem 3.3. Assume that Assumptions 1 to 8 hold and that $\tilde{m} \rightarrow \infty$, $n^{-1/2}\tilde{m}^2\lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1}\log \tilde{m} \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$(3.10) \quad \int_{\mathcal{T}} \{\hat{a}(t) - a(t)\}^2 dt = O_p\left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{n\lambda_{\tilde{m}}} + \frac{\tilde{m}}{n^2\lambda_{\tilde{m}}^2} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{j^3 a_j^2}{\lambda_j^2} + \frac{1}{n\lambda_{\tilde{m}}} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{a_j^2}{\lambda_j} + \tilde{m}^{-2\gamma+1}\right).$$

If $\lambda_j \sim j^{-\delta}$, $\tilde{m} \sim n^{1/(\delta+2\gamma)}$, $\gamma > 2$ and $\gamma > 1 + \delta/2$, then $\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} j^3 a_j^2 \lambda_j^{-2} \leq C_9(\log \tilde{m} + \tilde{m}^{2\delta+4-2\gamma})$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} a_j^2 \lambda_j^{-1} < +\infty$, where C_9 is a positive constant. Then we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. Under Assumptions 1 to 8, if $\lambda_j \sim j^{-\delta}$, $\tilde{m} \sim n^{1/(\delta+2\gamma)}$ and $\gamma > \min(2, 1 + \delta/2)$, then it follows that

$$(3.11) \quad \int_{\mathcal{T}} \{\hat{a}(t) - a(t)\}^2 dt = O_p \left(n^{-(2\gamma-1)/(\delta+2\gamma)} \right).$$

The global convergence result (3.11) indicates that the estimator $\hat{a}(t)$ attains the same convergence rate as those of the estimators of Hall and Horowitz [10], which are optimal in the minimax sense.

From Theorem 3.2, we have $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta_0\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Then for sufficiently large n , $U_{\hat{\beta}} = U_{\beta_0}$ and $U^{\hat{\beta}} = U^{\beta_0}$.

Theorem 3.4. Suppose that Assumptions 1 to 9 hold. Then,

$$(3.12) \quad \int_{U_{\beta_0}}^{U^{\beta_0}} \{\hat{g}(u) - g(u)\}^2 du = O_p \left((nh)^{-1} + h^{2p} \right).$$

Further, if $h = O(n^{-1/(2p+1)})$ in Assumption 9, then

$$(3.13) \quad \int_{U_{\beta_0}}^{U^{\beta_0}} \{\hat{g}(u) - g(u)\}^2 du = O_p \left(n^{-2p/(2p+1)} \right).$$

Remark 3.2. Under Assumptions 1-8 and from a proof of similar to that of Theorem 3.4, one can obtain

$$\int_{U_{\beta_0}}^{U^{\beta_0}} \{\tilde{g}(u) - g(u)\}^2 du = O_p \left((nh_0)^{-1} + h_0^{2p} \right) = O_p \left((nh_0)^{-1} \right).$$

Due to the fact that $nh_0^{2p} \rightarrow 0$, $\tilde{g}(u)$ does not attain the global convergence rate of $O_p(n^{-2p/(2p+1)})$, which is the optimal rate for nonparametric models. In fact, the assumption that $nh_0^{2p} \rightarrow 0$ is made in order to make the bias of the estimator $\hat{\beta}_{-d}$ in Theorem 3.2 negligible. This results in slower global convergence rate for the estimator $\tilde{g}(u)$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{(Y_i, X_i, W_i, Z_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. If $(Y_{n+1}, X_{n+1}, W_{n+1}, Z_{n+1})$ is a new vector of outcome and predictor variables taken from the same population as that of the data $\mathcal{S}$ and are independent of $\mathcal{S}$, then the *mean squared prediction error* (MSPE) of $\hat{Y}_{n+1}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSPE} &= E \left[\left\{ \int_{\mathcal{T}} \hat{a}(t) X_{n+1}(t) dt + W_{n+1}^T \hat{\alpha} + \hat{g}(Z_{n+1} \hat{\beta}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \left(\int_{\mathcal{T}} a(t) X_{n+1}(t) dt + W_{n+1}^T \alpha_0 + g(Z_{n+1} \beta_0) \right) \right\}^2 \middle| \mathcal{S} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.5. Under Assumptions 1 to 4 and 6 to 9, if $\lambda_j \sim j^{-\delta}$, $\tilde{m} \sim n^{1/(\delta+2\gamma)}$, where $\gamma > \min(2, 1 + \delta/2)$, $h_0 \sim n^{-\tau}$ with $1/(2p) < \tau < (\gamma - 2)/(3(\delta + 2\gamma))$ and $h = O(n^{-1/(2p+1)})$, then it follows that

$$(3.14) \quad \text{MSPE} = O_p \left(n^{-(\delta+2\gamma-1)/(\delta+2\gamma)} + O_p(n^{-2p/(2p+1)}) \right).$$

Furthermore, if $\delta + 2\gamma = 2p + 1$ then

$$(3.15) \quad \text{MSPE} = O_p \left(n^{-(\delta+2\gamma-1)/(\delta+2\gamma)} \right).$$

Remark 3.3. In Theorem 3.5, it is assumed that $h_0 \sim n^{-\tau}$ and $1/(2p) < \tau < (\gamma - 2)/(3(\delta + 2\gamma))$. If $\delta + 2\gamma = 2p + 1$, then the conditions that $p > \gamma$ and $\gamma > 5 + 3/(2p)$ are required. The preceding conditions hold when $p > \gamma \geq 5.3$.

4. Simulation results. In this section we present two Monte Carlo simulation studies to evaluate the finite-sample performance of the proposed estimator. The data are generated from the following models

$$(4.1) \quad Y_i = \int_{\mathcal{T}} a(t) X_i(t) dt + \alpha_0 W_i + \sin \left(\pi (Z_i^T \beta_0 - E) / (F - E) \right) + \varepsilon_i,$$

$$(4.2) \quad Y_i = \int_{\mathcal{T}} a(t) X_i(t) dt + \alpha_1 W_{i1} + \alpha_2 W_{i2} - 2Z_i^T \beta_0 + 5 + \varepsilon_i,$$

with $\mathcal{T} = [0, 1]$ and the trivariate random vectors Z_i 's have independent components following the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. In model (4.1), $\alpha_0 = 0.3$, $\beta_0 = (1, 1, 1)^T / \sqrt{3}$, $E = \sqrt{3}/2 - 1.645/\sqrt{12}$ and $F = \sqrt{3}/2 + 1.645/\sqrt{12}$. We let $W_i = 0$ for odd i and $W_i = 1$ for even i , and the ε_i 's are independent errors following $N(0, 0.5^2)$. We take $a(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{50} a_j \phi_j(t)$ and $X_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{50} \xi_{ij} \phi_j(t)$, where $a_1 = 0.3$ and $a_j = 4(-1)^{j+1} j^{-2}$, $j \geq 2$; $\phi_1(t) \equiv 1$ and $\phi_j(t) = 2^{1/2} \cos((j-1)\pi t)$, $j \geq 2$; the ξ_{ij} 's are independently and normally distributed with $N(0, j^{-\delta})$. In model (4.2), $\alpha_1 = -2$, $\alpha_2 = 1.5$, $\beta_0 = (1, 2, 2)^T / 3$ and $X_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{50} \xi_{ij} \phi_j(t)$, the ξ_{ij} 's are independently and normally distributed with $N(0, \lambda_j)$, where $\lambda_1 = 1$, $\lambda_j = 0.22^2(1 - 0.0001j)^2$ if $2 \leq j \leq 4$, $\lambda_{5j+k} = 0.22^2((5j)^{-\delta/2} - 0.0001k)^2$ for $j \geq 1$ and $0 \leq k \leq 4$. Further, $W_{ik} = \tilde{W}_{ik} + V_{ik}$ and $\tilde{W}_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^{50} k j^{-2} \xi_{ij}$ for $k = 1, 2$. The V_{ik} 's are independently and normally distributed with $N(-1, 2^2)$ and $N(2, 3^2)$, respectively, and independent of ξ_{ij} . Finally, the error terms ε_i 's in both (4.1) and (4.2) are independent $N(0, 1)$ random variables.

For the functional linear part of model (4.1), the eigenvalues of the operator K are well-spaced, while the latter part of model (4.1) was investigated

by Carroll et al. [4] and Yu and Ruppert [38]. In model (4.2), the eigenvalues of the operator K are closely spaced, while the link function $g(u) = -2u + 5$ is a linear function. All our results are reported based on the average over 500 replications for each setting. In each sample, we first use a linear function to replace $g(u)$ and use the least squares estimates for the partial functional linear model as an initial estimator. The function $g(u)$ is approximated using a cubic spline with equally spaced knots. We note from our simulation results (see Table 3) that parametric estimators are not sensitive to the choices of parameters h_0 and m . Here we take $h_0 = c_0 n^{-1/5}$ and $m = 5$, with $c_0 = 1$. When we compute the estimators of $g(u)$ and $a(t)$, the parameters K_n and m are selected respectively by the BIC given in Section 2.

TABLE 1
Results of Monte Carlo experiments for model (4.2). The biases and sds of parametric estimators and MISE of $\hat{g}(u)$ and MISE of $\hat{a}(t)$.

		n=100			n=200		
		LSPFL	ORACLE	PBS	LSPFL	ORACLE	PBS
$\hat{\alpha}_0$	bias	-0.0019	0.0034	-0.0008	-0.0025	0.0002	0.0002
	sd	0.0836	0.0330	0.0307	0.0565	0.0159	0.0122
$\hat{\beta}_{01}$	bias	-0.3678	-0.0066	-0.0056	-0.3365	-0.0037	0.0006
	sd	0.5445	0.0441	0.0464	0.5141	0.0202	0.0206
$\hat{\beta}_{02}$	bias	-0.3780	-0.0075	-0.0031	-0.3283	-0.0041	-0.0018
	sd	0.5449	0.0457	0.0479	0.5201	0.0263	0.0178
$\hat{\beta}_{03}$	bias	-0.0771	0.0082	0.0016	-0.0553	0.0058	-0.0001
	sd	0.2695	0.0506	0.0599	0.2694	0.0307	0.0239
$\hat{g}(u)$	MISE			0.0090			0.0007
$\hat{a}(t)$	MISE	0.1205	0.0189	0.0218	0.0756	0.0082	0.0084

Table 1 reports the biases and standard deviations (sd) of the profile B-spline (PBS) estimators $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\beta}_0 = (\hat{\beta}_{01}, \hat{\beta}_{02}, \hat{\beta}_{03})^T$ and the mean integrated squared errors (MISE) of the estimators $\hat{g}(u)$ and $\hat{a}(t)$ for model (4.1) based on $\delta = 1.5$ and sample sizes $n = 100, 200$. Figure 1 displays the true curves and the mean estimated curves over 500 simulations with sample size $n = 100$ of $g(u)$, $a(t)$ and their 95% pointwise confidence bands. Table 2 reports the biases and standard deviations (sd) of the estimators $\hat{\alpha}_k$ for $k = 1, 2$ and $\hat{\beta}_1 = (\hat{\beta}_{11}, \hat{\beta}_{12}, \hat{\beta}_{13})^T$, and the mean integrated squared errors (MISE) of the estimators $\hat{g}(u)$ and $\hat{a}(t)$ for model (4.2) with $\delta = 1.5$ and $n = 100, 200$. For comparison purposes, Tables 1 and 2 also list the simulation results based on the least squares partial functional linear (LSPFL) estimators, which are obtained by using a linear function to approximate the link function g . Further, Table 1 also lists the simulation results based on the nonlinear least squares (ORACLE) estimation method when the exact form of sinusoidal model is known.

TABLE 2
Results of Monte Carlo experiments for model (4.2). The biases ($\times 10^{-4}$) and sds ($\times 10^{-4}$) of parametric estimators and MISE ($\times 10^{-4}$) of $\hat{g}(u)$ and MISE of $\hat{a}(t)$.

		n=100		n=200	
		LSPFL	PBS	LSPFL	PBS
$\hat{\alpha}_1$	bias (sd)	0.078(6.815)	0.100(6.870)	0.186(4.415)	0.173(4.435)
$\hat{\alpha}_2$	bias (sd)	-0.071(4.612)	-0.085(4.666)	0.359(3.038)	0.373(3.056)
$\hat{\beta}_{11}$	bias (sd)	-0.707(22.725)	-0.753 (23.162)	0.942(14.762)	0.816(14.896)
$\hat{\beta}_{12}$	bias (sd)	-1.670(18.370)	-1.720(18.347)	0.711(11.939)	0.735(11.906)
$\hat{\beta}_{13}$	bias (sd)	1.936(17.630)	2.007(17.655)	-1.220(11.944)	-1.181(11.919)
$\hat{g}(u)$	MISE		3.852		2.503
$\hat{a}(t)$	MISE	0.0087	0.0096	0.0047	0.0044

We observe from Table 1 that the least squares partial functional linear (LSPFL) method gives poor estimates, while our profile B-spline estimates are far more accurate than the LSPFL estimates, and they can be as accurate as those obtained from the ORACLE when the exact form of sinusoidal model is known. Figure 1 shows that the difference between the true curves and the mean estimated curves are barely visible, and it shows that the bias is very small in the estimates. Furthermore, the 95% pointwise confidence bands are reasonably close to the true curve, showing a very little variation in the estimates. Table 2 shows that, even if the unknown link function $g(u)$ is a linear function, our profile B-spline estimates behave as good as the least squares partial functional linear estimates. Both tables indicate that the proposed profile B-spline method yields accurate estimates and outperforms the least squares partial functional linear estimates when the link function is nonlinear, and it is comparable to the least squares partial functional linear estimates when the link function is a linear function.

To study the prediction performance of the proposed profile B-spline method, we generated samples of $n = 100, 200$ from models (4.1) and (4.2) with $\delta \in \{1.1, 1.5, 2\}$ for estimation, where δ is related to the eigenvalue of the operator with kernel K . We also generated test samples of size 300 to compute the prediction mean absolute error (MAE) defined by $MAE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\tilde{Y}_{n+i} - \hat{Y}_{n+i}|$, where $\tilde{Y}_{n+i} = \int_{\mathcal{T}} a(t)X_{n+i}(t)dt + W_{n+i}^T \alpha_0 + g_0(Z_{n+i}^T \beta_0)$ and $\hat{Y}_{n+i} = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \hat{a}(t)X_{n+i}(t)dt + W_{n+i}^T \hat{\alpha} + \hat{g}(Z_{n+i}^T \hat{\beta})$. Figures 2 and 3 display the boxplots of MAE based on 500 replications and $n = 300$. We observe that the proposed profile B-spline method shows good prediction performances for both models and the MAEs are quite small even if $n = 100$. Figure 2 also shows that the MAE decreases as n increases or as δ increases.

For different m and h_0 , Table 3 exhibits the MSEs of the estimators $\hat{\alpha}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_{01}$ for model (4.1) with $\delta = 1.5$ and sample size $n = 200$. We observe




FIG 1. The actual and the mean estimated curves for $g(u)$ and $a(t)$ in model (4.1) with $n = 100$ and the 95% pointwise confidence bands. (a) is the figure for $a(t)$ and (b) is the figure for $g(u)$. —, true curves; - - -, mean estimated curves; ..., 95% pointwise confidence bands.

TABLE 3
MSE ($\times 10^{-3}$) of $\hat{\alpha}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_{01}$ in model (4.1). The sample size is $n = 200$.

	h_0	m								
		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$\hat{\alpha}_0$	0.2	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.6
	0.3	1.4	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.3
	0.4	1.4	0.8	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.6
	0.5	1.4	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.4
$\hat{\beta}_{01}$	0.2	1.8	2.0	1.0	0.5	0.9	1.1	0.8	0.9	1.6
	0.3	1.5	1.5	0.7	0.6	1.4	0.3	1.1	0.7	1.4
	0.4	1.5	1.5	0.7	0.6	1.1	0.3	1.1	1.1	1.4
	0.5	2.5	1.6	1.5	0.8	0.6	1.0	1.6	1.2	1.0

from Table 3 that MSEs of $\hat{\alpha}_0$ and $\hat{\beta}_{01}$ are not very sensitive to the change of m and h_0 , and the estimators of α_0 and β_{01} are efficient under a broad range of values for m and h_0 . The MSEs of $\hat{\beta}_{02}$ and $\hat{\beta}_{03}$ also show similar behaviors and are omitted here.

5. Real data application. In this section we analyze a real data set using the proposed method. For this purpose we use the diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) data with 217 subjects from the NIH Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) study. For more information on how this data were collected etc., see <http://www.adni-info.org>. The DTI data were processed by two key steps including a weighted least squares estimation method [1, 40] to construct the diffusion tensors and a TBSS pipeline in




FIG 2. Boxplots of MAE for models (4.1) ((a) and (b)) and (4.2) ((c) and (d)). Label 1 is boxplot for $\delta = 1.1$, 2 is boxplot for $\delta = 1.5$ and 3 is boxplot for $\delta = 2$.

FSL [28] to register DTIs from multiple subjects to create a mean image and a mean skeleton. This data have been recently analyzed by many authors using different models; see, e.g., Yu et al. [37], Li et al. [15] and the references therein.

Our interest is to predict mini-mental state examination (MMSE) scores, one of the most widely used screening tests to provide brief and objective measures of cognitive functioning for a long time. The MMSE scores have been seen as a reliable and valid clinical measure quantitatively assessing the severity of cognitive impairment. It was believed that the MMSE scores to be affected by demographic features such as age, education and cultural background [31] gender [23, 21], and possibly some genetic factors, for example, APOE polymorphic alleles [18].

After cleaning the raw data that failed in quality control or had miss-

ing data, we include totally 196 individuals in our analysis. The response of interest Y is the MMSE scores. The functional covariate is fractional anisotropy (FA) values along the corpus callosum (CC) fiber tract with 83 equally spaced grid points, which can be treated as a function of arc-length. FA measures the inhomogeneous extent of local barriers to water diffusion and the averaged magnitude of local water diffusion [2]. The scalar covariates of primary interests include gender (W_1), handedness (W_2), education level (W_3), genotypes for apoe4 (W_4, W_5 , categorical data with 3 levels), age (W_6), ADAS13 (Z_1) and ADAS11 (Z_2). The genotypes apoe4 is one of three major alleles of apolipoprotein E (Apo-E), a major cholesterol carrier that supports lipid transport and injury repair in the brain. APOE polymorphic alleles are the main genetic determinants of Alzheimer disease risk [18]. ADAS11 and ADAS13 are respectively the 11-item and 13-item versions of the Alzheimer's Disease Assessment Scale-Cognitive subscale (ADAS-Cog), which were originally developed to measure cognition in patients within various stages of Alzheimer's Disease [17, 42, 22].

We study the following two models

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} Y = & \int_0^1 a(t)X(t)dt + \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 W_1 + \alpha_2 W_2 + \alpha_3 W_3 + \alpha_4 W_4 + \alpha_5 W_5 \\ & + \alpha_6 W_6 + \beta_1 Z_1 + \beta_2 Z_2 + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} Y = & \int_0^1 a(t)X(t)dt + \alpha_1 W_1 + \alpha_2 W_2 + \alpha_3 W_3 + \alpha_4 W_4 + \alpha_5 W_5 \\ & + \alpha_6 W_6 + g(\beta_1 Z_1 + \beta_2 Z_2) + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where $W_1 = 1$ stands for male and $W_1 = 0$ stands for female, $W_2 = 1$ denotes right-handed and $W_2 = 0$ denotes left-handed, $W_4 = 1$ and $W_5 = 0$ indicates type 0 for apoe4, $W_4 = 0$ and $W_5 = 1$ indicates type 1 for apoe4 and both $W_4 = 0$ and $W_5 = 0$ indicates type 2 for apoe4. The functional component $X(t)$ is chosen as the centered fractional anisotropy (FA) values so that $E[X(t)] = 0$. Model (5.1) is a partial functional linear model, while model (5.2) is partial functional linear single index model in which ADAS13 (Z_1) and ADAS11 (Z_2) are index variables.

TABLE 4
The parametric estimators for models (5.1) and (5.2).

model	α_1	α_2	α_3	α_4	α_5	α_6	β_1	β_2
(5.1)	0.0758	0.4317	0.1105	0.6875	0.5581	-0.0239	-0.0429	-0.1865
(5.2)	-0.0754	0.1814	0.1138	0.5961	0.5245	-0.0305	0.1957	0.9807

The parametric and nonparametric components in the models are computed by the procedure given in Section 2, with the nonparametric function




FIG 3. The solid lines are the estimated curves of $a(t)$ in model (5.1) (a), $a(t)$ in model (5.2) (b), and $g(u)$ in model (5.2) (c); The dotted lines are their corresponding 95% point-wise confidence intervals.

$g(u)$ being approximated by a cubic spline with equally spaced knots. Since the values of Z_1 and Z_2 are large, we choose $h_0 = 5.0$ for model (5.2) and $m = 3$ for parametric estimation. Table 4 exhibits the parametric estimators, and Figure 4 shows the estimated curves of $a(t)$ and $g(u)$. For model (5.1), $\hat{a}_0 = 28.9388$. The MSE of Y for models (5.1) and (5.2) are 2.8684 and 2.7782, respectively, and can be further reduced for model (5.2) as the number of knots increases.

From Table 4 and Figure 3, we observe that in both models MMSE is decreasing in terms of ADAS13 and ADAS11. However, in Figure 3 this decline is found to be nonlinear evidenced by the nonlinear trends of $g(u)$ in model (5.2). In single index models (5.2), we found that MMSE is higher for female than male, which is consistent with the results in the literature [23, 21], while model (5.1) incorrectly finds the opposite. Although we may not able to perform a formal test on model fitting, these observations show the superiority of the single index model (5.2).

To evaluate the prediction performance of the three models, we applied a combination of the bootstrap and the cross-validation method to the data set. For each bootstrap sample, we randomly divided the data into ten partitions. Since the number of individuals is not large, we used nine folds of the data to estimate the model and the remaining fold for the testing data set. We calculated the mean squared prediction error (MSPE) for the testing data set. The MSPEs for the two models over the 200 replications are reported as boxplots in Figure 4. The means for MSPEs of the 200 replications for models (5.1) and (5.2) are 3.6996 and 3.4249, respectively. The medians




FIG 4. *Boxplots for the mean squared prediction error (MSPE) for three models. Label 1 is boxplot for model (5.1) and 2 is boxplot for model (5.2).*

for MSPEs of the 200 replications for models (5.1) and (5.2) are 3.5464 and 3.3421, respectively. This figure shows that model (5.2) fits the data better than model (5.1). We also calculated 95% point-wise confidence intervals of the estimated curves of $a(t)$ in model (5.1), $a(t)$ in model (5.2), and $g(u)$ in model (5.2), which are shown as (a), (b) and (c), respectively, in Figure 4. From Figure 5, it is evidenced that the functional slope for both models are also identical, while $g(u)$ has a clear nonlinear feature. This also confirms that model (5.2) is more flexible than model (5.1).

6. Summarizing remarks. Functional data analysis is now very popular as it provides modern analytical tools for data that are recorded as images or as a continuous phenomenon over a period of time. Classical multivariate statistical tools may fail or may be irrelevant in that context to take benefit from the underlying functional structure of functional data. As a great variety of real data applications involve functional phenomena, which may be represented as curves or more complex objects, the demand of models and statistical tools for analyzing functional data is ever more increasing.

The need for more comprehensive models that more adaptable motivated us to propose and study a partial functional partially linear single index (PFPLSI) model in this paper. The proposed PFPLSI model generalizes the standard functional linear model, partial functional linear models and the partially linear single-index model, among others. We have implemented functional principal component analysis to estimate the slope function component of the PFPLSI model, and the unknown link function of the single-index component has been approximated by a B-spline function. To estimate

the unknown parameters in the proposed PFPLSI model, we have proposed a profile B-spline method. We have derived the asymptotic properties, including the consistency and asymptotic normality, of the proposed estimators of the unknown parameters. The global convergence of the proposed estimator of the functional slope function has also been established, and this convergence result has been shown to be optimal in the minimax sense. A two-stage procedure was used to estimate the unknown link function attaining the optimal global convergence rate of convergence. We have also derived convergence rates of the mean squared prediction error for a predictor. The lower prediction error demonstrates the rationality of our modelling and the effectiveness of the proposed estimation procedure. Monte Carlo studies conducted to examine the performance of the proposed methodology demonstrate that the proposed estimators perform quite satisfactorily and the theoretical results established seem to be valid.

An alternative approach to the PFPLSI model (1.1) that may be of interest is *functional linear quantile regression*. The functional linear quantile regression where the conditional quantiles of the responses are modeled by a set of scalar covariates and functional covariates. There may be several advantages of using conditional quantiles instead of working with conditional means. First, the quantile regression, in particular the median regression, provides an alternative and complement to the mean regression, while being resistant to outliers in the responses. In other words, it is more efficient than the mean regression when the errors follow a distribution with heavy tails. Second, the quantile regression is capable of dealing with heteroscedasticity, that is the situations where variances depend on some covariates. Finally, the quantile regression can give a more complete picture on how the responses are affected by covariates; e.g., some tail behaviors of the responses conditional on the covariates. For more details on quantile regression, one may refer to the monograph of Koenker [14]. In view of the model (1.1), we consider the following functional linear quantile regression: for given $\tau \in (0, 1)$,

$$Q_\tau(y|X, Z, W) = \int_{\mathcal{T}} a_\tau(t)X(t)dt + W^T\alpha_{0\tau} + g(Z^T\beta_{0\tau})$$

where $Q_\tau(y|X, Z, W)$ is the τ -th conditional quantile of Y given the covariates (X, Z, W) . Although there is some reported work on functional linear quantile regression in the literature, the above model has not been studied yet. Further research is needed for these advancements.

Appendix: Proofs. In this section we let $C > 0$ denote a generic constant of which the value may change from line to line. For a matrix

$A = (a_{ij})$, set $\|A\|_\infty = \max_i \sum_j |a_{ij}|$ and $|A|_\infty = \max_{i,j} |a_{ij}|$. For a vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_k)^T$, set $\|v\|_\infty = \sum_{j=1}^k |v_j|$ and $|v|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} |v_j|$. We write $Y_i = Y_i^* + \varepsilon_i$ with $Y_i^* = \int_{\mathcal{T}} a(t) X_i(t) dt + W_i^T \alpha_0 + g(Z_i^T \beta_0)$. Denote $\check{Y}_i = Y_i^* - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* \tilde{\xi}_{il}$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i = \varepsilon_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \varepsilon_l \tilde{\xi}_{il}$ and $\check{Y} = (\check{Y}_1, \dots, \check{Y}_n)^T$, $\tilde{\varepsilon} = (\tilde{\varepsilon}_1, \dots, \tilde{\varepsilon}_n)^T$. Then $\tilde{Y}_i = \check{Y}_i + \tilde{\varepsilon}_i$ and $\tilde{Y} = \check{Y} + \tilde{\varepsilon}$. Define $P(\beta) = I_n - \tilde{B}(\beta)(\tilde{B}^T(\beta)\tilde{B}(\beta))^{-1}\tilde{B}^T(\beta)$, where I_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. By (3.5), (2.9) and (2.10), we have

$$(A.1) \quad G_n(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{n}[(\check{Y} - \tilde{W}\alpha)^T P(\beta)(\check{Y} - \tilde{W}\alpha) + 2(\check{Y} - \tilde{W}\alpha)^T P(\beta)\tilde{\varepsilon} + \tilde{\varepsilon}^T P(\beta)\tilde{\varepsilon}].$$

Lemma A.1. Suppose that Assumptions 1 to 4, 5' and 7 hold. Then

$$\frac{1}{n}(\check{Y} - \tilde{W}\alpha)^T(\check{Y} - \tilde{W}\alpha) = \rho(\alpha) + o_p(1),$$

where $\rho(\alpha) = (\alpha - \alpha_0)^T E(VV^T)(\alpha - \alpha_0) - 2b_0^T E[B_{\beta_0}(Z^T \beta_0)V^T](\alpha - \alpha_0) + b_0^T \Gamma(\beta_0, \beta_0)b_0$, and $o_p(1)$ holds uniformly for α in any bounded neighborhood of α_0 .

Proof. Define $\check{\xi}_{il} = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\xi_{lj}\xi_{ij}}{\lambda_j}$, $\check{Y}_{i1} = Y_i^* - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* \check{\xi}_{il}$ and $\check{Y}_{i2} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* (\check{\xi}_{il} - \xi_{il})$. Then $\check{Y}_i = \check{Y}_{i1} - \check{Y}_{i2}$ and

$$(A.2) \quad \frac{1}{n}\check{Y}^T \check{Y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\check{Y}_{i1}^2 - 2\check{Y}_{i1}\check{Y}_{i2} + \check{Y}_{i2}^2).$$

Denote $\check{Y}_{i21} = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_j} [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* (\hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj})] \xi_{ij}$, $\check{Y}_{i22} = \sum_{j=1}^m (\frac{1}{\lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j}) (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* \hat{\xi}_{lj}) \xi_{ij}$ and $\check{Y}_{i23} = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_j} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* \hat{\xi}_{lj}) (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij})$. Then we have

$$(A.3) \quad \check{Y}_{i2}^2 \leq 3(\check{Y}_{i21}^2 + \check{Y}_{i22}^2 + \check{Y}_{i23}^2).$$

From Lemma 5.1 of Hall and Horowitz (2007) it follows that

$$(A.4) \quad \hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj} = \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{\xi_{lk}}{\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_k} \int \Delta \hat{\phi}_j \phi_k + \xi_{lj} \int (\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j) \phi_j,$$

where $\Delta = \hat{K} - K$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* (\hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj})]^2 &\leq 2(\sum_{k \neq j} \frac{\xi_k}{\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_k} \int \Delta \hat{\phi}_j \phi_k)^2 + 2(\xi_j \int (\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j) \phi_j)^2 \\ &\leq 2[\sum_{k \neq j} \frac{\xi_k^2}{(\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_k)^2}] [\sum_{k=1}^\infty (\int \Delta \hat{\phi}_j \phi_k)^2] + \\ &\quad 2\xi_j^2 (\int (\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j) \phi_j)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{\xi}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* \xi_{lj}$. Lemma 6.1 of Cardot et al. (2007) yields that

$$|\lambda_j - \lambda_k| \geq \lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} \geq \lambda_m - \lambda_{m+1} \geq \lambda_m/(m+1) \geq \lambda_m/(2m)$$

uniformly for $1 \leq j \leq m$. From (5.2) of Hall and Horowitz (2007) we have $\sup_{j \geq 1} |\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j| \leq \|\Delta\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ and

$$(A.5) \quad (\int (\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j) \phi_j)^2 \leq \|\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|^2 \leq C \frac{\|\Delta\|^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1})^2} \leq C \|\Delta\|^2 \lambda_j^{-2} j^2,$$

where $\|\Delta\| = (\int_{\mathcal{T}} \int_{\mathcal{T}} \Delta^2(s, t) ds dt)^{1/2}$. Using Parseval's identity, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\int \Delta \hat{\phi}_j \phi_k)^2 = \int (\int \Delta \hat{\phi}_j)^2 \leq \|\Delta\|^2 = O_p(n^{-1}).$$

Assumption 5' implies that $|\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j| = o_p(\lambda_m/m)$. Consequently, $\sum_{k \neq j} \frac{\xi_k^2}{(\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_k)^2} = \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{\xi_k^2}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^2} [1 + o_p(1)]$, where $o_p(1)$ holds uniformly for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Using Lemma 6.2 of Cardot et al. (2007) and the fact that $(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^2 \geq (\lambda_k - \lambda_{k+1})^2$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{1}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^2} E(\xi_k^2) \\ & \leq C \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{1}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_k)^2} [n^{-1} \lambda_k + a_k^{*2} \lambda_k^2] \\ & \leq C [\frac{1}{n(\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1})} \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{\lambda_k}{|\lambda_j - \lambda_k|} + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\lambda_k^2 a_k^{*2}}{(\lambda_k - \lambda_{k+1})^2} + \\ & \quad \sum_{k=j+1}^{2j} \frac{j^2 a_k^{*2}}{(k-j)^2} + \sum_{k=2j+1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_k^2 a_k^{*2}}{(\lambda_j - \lambda_{2j})^2}] \\ & \leq C(n^{-1} \lambda_j^{-1} j^2 \log j + 1). \end{aligned}$$

where $a_k^* = a_k + \sum_{r=1}^q w_{rk} \alpha_{0r}$. Assumption 2 yields that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-2} j^2 \log j \leq m^{-2} \lambda_m^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^m j^4 \log j \leq \lambda_m^{-2} m^3 \log m$$

and $\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-1} \leq \lambda_m^{-1} m$. Therefore,

$$(A.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \check{Y}_{i21}^2 & \leq (\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_j} [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* (\hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj})]^2) (\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n \lambda_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij}^2) \\ & = O_p(n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-2} m^4 \log m + n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} m^2). \end{aligned}$$

Decomposing $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* \hat{\xi}_{lj} = \vec{\xi}_j + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* (\hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj})$ and using (A.6), we obtain

$$(A.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \check{Y}_{i22}^2 & \leq C \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)^2}{\lambda_j^3} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* \hat{\xi}_{lj})^2 [1 + o_p(1)] \\ & \quad (\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n \lambda_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij}^2) \\ & = O_p(n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} m + n^{-3} \lambda_m^{-4} m^4 \log m + n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-3} m^2). \end{aligned}$$

By (A.10) of Tang (2015), it holds that

$$(A.8) \quad \|\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|^2 = O_p(n^{-1}j^2 \log j)$$

uniformly for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Using (A.7) and (A.8), we obtain

$$(A.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \check{Y}_{i23}^2 &\leq (\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_j^2} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n Y_l^* \hat{\xi}_{lj})^2) (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i\|^2) (\sum_{j=1}^m \|\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|^2) \\ &= O_p((n^{-1}m^3 + n^{-3}\lambda_m^{-3}m^6 \log m + n^{-2}\lambda_m^{-2}m^4) \log m). \end{aligned}$$

Then by (A.3), (A.6), (A.7), (A.9) and Assumption 5', we conclude that

$$(A.10) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \check{Y}_{i2}^2 = O_p(n^{-2}\lambda_m^{-2}m^4 \log m + n^{-1}\lambda_m^{-1}m^2) = o_p(h_0^2).$$

Define $\xi_j^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \lambda_j^{-1/2} \xi_{lj} Y_l^*$. Since $E[\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} (\xi_j^* - E(\xi_j^*))^2] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^m E(\xi_j Y^*)^2 \leq Cn^{-1}$, we then have $\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |\xi_j^* - E(\xi_j^*)| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Hence, we have

$$(A.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \check{Y}_{i1}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i^{*2} - 2 \sum_{j=1}^m \xi_j^{*2} + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\xi_j^{*2}}{n\lambda_j} (\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij}^2) + \\ &\quad \sum_{j \neq j'} \xi_j^* \xi_{j'}^* \bar{\xi}_{jj'} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^\infty (a_j + \sum_{r=1}^q w_{rj} \alpha_{0r})^2 \lambda_j + E(V^T \alpha_0 + g(Z^T \beta_0))^2 \\ &\quad - 2 \sum_{j=1}^m (a_j + \sum_{r=1}^q w_{rj} \alpha_{0r})^2 \lambda_j + \\ &\quad \sum_{j=1}^m (a_j + \sum_{r=1}^q w_{rj} \alpha_{0r})^2 \lambda_j + o_p(1) \\ &= E(V^T \alpha_0 + g(Z^T \beta_0))^2 + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\xi}_{jj'} = \frac{1}{n(\lambda_j \lambda_{j'})^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} \xi_{ij'}$. Combining (A.2), (A.10), (A.11) and (3.1), we conclude that

$$(A.12) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{\mathbf{Y}}^T \check{\mathbf{Y}} = \alpha_0^T E(VV^T) \alpha_0 + 2\mathbf{b}_0^T E[\mathbf{B}_{\beta_0}(Z^T \beta_0) V^T] \alpha_0 + \mathbf{b}_0^T \Gamma(\beta_0, \beta_0) \mathbf{b}_0 + o_p(1).$$

Similar to the proof of (A.12), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}} &= E(VV^T) + o_p(1), \\ \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}} &= \alpha_0^T E(V^T V) + \mathbf{b}_0^T E[\mathbf{B}_{\beta_0}(Z^T \beta_0) V] + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma A.1 follows from (A.12) and the preceding expression.

Lemma A.2. Under Assumptions 1, 4 and 5', it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} \max_{1 \leq k \leq K_\beta} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} B_{k\beta}^{(r)}(Z_i^T \beta) \right| \\ &= o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{\frac{1}{4}-r} \log n), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_{k,k'} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) B_{k'\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) - E[B_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) B_{k'\beta}(Z_i^T \beta)] \right| \\ &= o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_{k,k'} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B'_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) B'_{k'\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) - E[B'_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) B'_{k'\beta}(Z_i^T \beta)] \right| \\ &= o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{3}{2}} \log n), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_{k,k'} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) B''_{k'\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) - E[B_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) B''_{k'\beta}(Z_i^T \beta)] \right| \\ &= o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{3}{2}} \log n) \end{aligned}$$

for $r = 0, 1, 2$.

Proof. We give only the proof for the first step with $r = 2$, as the first step with $r = 0, 1$ and the other steps follow from similar arguments. Define $\eta_{jki}(Z_i^T \beta) = \lambda_j^{-1/2} \xi_{ij} B''_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta)$. Applying Assumptions 1 and Lemma 5 of Kato [13], we have $\max_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_j^{-1/2} \xi_{ij}| = O_p((mn)^{1/4})$. Hence, by Assumption 5', for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive constant $\tilde{C}_1$ such that

$$(A.13) \quad P\left\{ \max_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_j^{-1/2} \xi_{ij}| \geq \tilde{C}_1 n^{1/2} h_0^{1/4} (\log n)^{-1} \right\} < \epsilon/4.$$

Using Assumptions 1 and the fact that $|B''_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta)| \leq C h_0^{-2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |E[\lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{ij} B''_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) I_{\{|\lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{ij}| \geq \tilde{C}_1 n^{\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log n)^{-1}\}}]| \\ & \leq C n^{-\frac{3}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{11}{4}} (\log n)^3 E[\lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{ij}]^4 < \varepsilon n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} \log n/2. \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}_{jki}(Z_i^T \beta) &= \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{ij} B''_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) I_{\{|\lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{ij}| < \tilde{C}_1 n^{\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log n)^{-1}\}} \\ &\quad - E[\lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{ij} B''_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) I_{\{|\lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{ij}| < \tilde{C}_1 n^{\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log n)^{-1}\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P\{\sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_{j,k} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_{jki}(Z_i^T \beta) \right| \geq \varepsilon n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} \log n\} \\ (A.14) \quad & \leq P\{\max_{j,i} |\lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xi_{ij}| \geq \tilde{C}_1 n^{\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log n)^{-1}\} \\ & \quad + P\{\sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_{j,k} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\eta}_{jki}(Z_i^T \beta) \right| \geq \varepsilon n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} \log n/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $|B''_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta)| \leq C h_0^{-2}$, again we obtain

$$(A.15) \quad |\tilde{\eta}_{jki}(Z_i^T \beta)| \leq C n^{\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} (\log n)^{-1}.$$

From Assumption 1, it follows that

$$(A.16) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n E(\tilde{\eta}_{jki}^2(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta})) \leq Cn\lambda_j^{-1}(E[B_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}}''^4(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta})]E(\xi_j^4))^{1/2} \leq Cnh_0^{-7/2}.$$

For $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 = (\beta_{11}, \dots, \beta_{1d})^T \in \Theta_{\rho_0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 = (\beta_{21}, \dots, \beta_{2d})^T \in \Theta_{\rho_0}$, define $|\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_1| = \max_{1 \leq r \leq d-1} |\beta_{2r} - \beta_{1r}|$. Since $\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\xi_{ij}| = O_p(m)$, then there exists a positive $\tilde{C}_2$ such that

$$(A.17) \quad P\left\{\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\xi_{ij}| \geq \tilde{C}_2 m\right\} < \epsilon/4.$$

From (2.6), for all $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_0}$, the total of different $B_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u)$ is not more than $(s+1)k_n$. Let Θ_{ρ_0} be divided into N disjoint parts $\Theta_{\rho_{01}}, \dots, \Theta_{\rho_{0N}}$ such that for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_{0l}}, 1 \leq l \leq N$ and any $1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq (s+1)k_n$, when $\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\xi_{ij}| < \tilde{C}_2 m$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_{0l}}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\eta}_{jki}(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\eta}_{jki}(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_l) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_{0l}}} \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_{ij}| |B_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}}''(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) - B_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}}''(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_l)| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + E(|\xi_{ij}| |B_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}}''(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) - B_{k\boldsymbol{\beta}}''(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_l)|) \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_{0l}}} Ch_0^{-3} \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\xi_{ij}| + E(\lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\xi_{ij}|) \right) |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_l| \\ & \leq Cmh_0^{-3} |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_l| < \epsilon n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} \log n/4. \end{aligned}$$

This can be done with $N = C(mn^{1/2}/(\epsilon h_0^{5/4} \log n))^{d-1}$. Using Bernstein inequality and (A.15), (A.16) and Assumption 5', for sufficiently large n , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_{j,k} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\eta}_{jki}(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right| \geq \epsilon n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} \log n/2, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\xi_{ij}| < \tilde{C}_2 m \right) \\ & \leq P\left(\cup_{l=1}^N \left\{ \max_{j,k} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\eta}_{jki}(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_l) \right| \geq \epsilon n^{-\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} \log n/4 \right\}\right) \\ & \leq Cmk_n N \exp \left\{ - \frac{\epsilon^2 n h_0^{-\frac{7}{2}} (\log n)^2}{32Cn h_0^{-7/2} + 4Cn^{\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} (\log n)^{-1} \epsilon n^{\frac{1}{2}} h_0^{-\frac{7}{4}} \log n} \right\} < \epsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma A.2 follows from (A.13), (A.14), (A.17) and the preceding inequality.

Lemma A.3. Assume that Assumptions 1, 2, 4 and 5' hold. Then it holds that

$$\frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(h_0^2),$$

where $o_p(h_0^2)$ holds uniformly for $1 \leq k, k' \leq K_\beta$ and $\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}$.

Proof. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{B}_{k\beta 1}(Z_i^T \beta) &= B_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_l^T \beta) \tilde{\xi}_{il}, \\ \tilde{B}_{k\beta 2}(Z_i^T \beta) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_l^T \beta) (\xi_{il} - \tilde{\xi}_{il}).\end{aligned}$$

We decompose the (k, k') th element of $\frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{B}_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) \tilde{B}_{k'\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\tilde{B}_{k\beta 1}(Z_i^T \beta) \tilde{B}_{k'\beta 1}(Z_i^T \beta) - \tilde{B}_{k\beta 1}(Z_i^T \beta) \tilde{B}_{k'\beta 2}(Z_i^T \beta) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \tilde{B}_{k\beta 2}(Z_i^T \beta) \tilde{B}_{k'\beta 1}(Z_i^T \beta) + \tilde{B}_{k\beta 2}(Z_i^T \beta) \tilde{B}_{k'\beta 2}(Z_i^T \beta) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma A.2, (A.8) and Assumptions 2 and 5', we obtain

(A.18)

$$\begin{aligned}& \sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_l^T \beta) (\hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj}) \right] \xi_{ij} \right)^2 \\ & \leq \sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_k \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_l^T \beta) (\hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj}) \right]^2 \right) \\ & \quad \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n\lambda_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij}^2 \right) \\ & \leq (\sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n B_{k\beta}^2(Z_l^T \beta)) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \|X_l\|^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\|\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|^2}{\lambda_j} \right) \\ & \quad \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n\lambda_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij}^2 \right) \\ & = O_p(n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} m^4 h_0 \log m) = o_p(h_0^3).\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (A.7), (A.9) and using Lemma A.2, we then deduce that

(A.19)

$$\begin{aligned}& \sup_{\beta \in \Theta_{\rho_0}} \max_k \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{\hat{\xi}_{ij}}{\lambda_j} - \frac{\xi_{ij}}{\lambda_j} \right) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_l^T \beta) \hat{\xi}_{lj} \right) \right)^2 \\ & = o_p(n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-2} m h_0^{1/2} (\log n)^2) + o_p(n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-1} m^3 h_0^{1/2} (\log n)^2) \\ & \quad + O_p(n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-3} m^4 h_0 \log m) + O_p(n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-2} m^6 h_0 (\log m)^2) \\ & = o_p(h_0^3).\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma A.2 and Assumption 5', we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{B}_{k\beta 1}(Z_i^T \beta) \tilde{B}_{k'\beta 1}(Z_i^T \beta) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_{k\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) B_{k'\beta}(Z_i^T \beta) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^m \rho_{kj} \rho_{k'j} \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^m \rho_{kj} \rho_{k'j} \left(\frac{1}{n\lambda_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij}^2 \right) + \sum_{j \neq j'} \rho_{kj} \rho_{k'j'} \tilde{\xi}_{jj'} \\ &= E[B_{k\beta}(Z^T \beta) B_{k'\beta}(Z^T \beta)] + o_p(h_0^2),\end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_{kj} = \frac{1}{n\lambda_j^{1/2}} \sum_{l=1}^n \xi_{lj} B_{k\beta}(Z_l^T \beta)$. Now Lemma A.3 follows from (A.18),

(A.19) and the preceding equation.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By arguments similar to those used in the proof of Lemmas A.1 and A.3, it follows that

$$(A.20) \quad \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta})(\check{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(h_0).$$

Using Lemma A.3, (A.20) and arguments similar to those used in the proof of Lemma 1 of Tang (2013), we then deduce that

$$(A.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}(\check{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta})(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta})\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta})(\check{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \\ = \Pi^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemma A.1 and (A.21) imply that

$$(A.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}(\check{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})^T \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta})(\check{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) &= \rho(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) - \Pi^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1) \\ &=: \tilde{G}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $o_p(1)$ holds uniformly for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is in any bounded neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0$. Similar to the proof of Lemmas A.1 and A.3, it holds that $\frac{1}{n}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}^T\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = \sigma^2 + o_p(1)$, $\frac{1}{n}(\check{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})^T\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = o_p(h_0)$ and $\frac{1}{n}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta})\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = o_p(h_0)$. Similar to the proof of (A.21) and (A.22), we further have $\frac{1}{n}(\check{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})^T \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = o_p(1)$ and $\frac{1}{n}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}^T \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = \sigma^2 + o_p(1)$. Therefore, from (A.1), (A.22) and (3.2), it follows that

$$(A.23) \quad G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(1),$$

where $o_p(1)$ holds uniformly for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is in any bounded neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0$. By the fact that $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is the minimizer of $G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and using (A.23), we have

$$(A.24) \quad G_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \leq G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + o_p(1).$$

By (A.1) and (A.22), we have that $\tilde{G}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \geq 0$ and $G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \geq \sigma^2$. From (3.2), one obtains $G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = \sigma^2 + o_p(1)$. Applying (A.23) and (A.24), we obtain that $\sigma^2 \leq G(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = G_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + o_p(1) \leq G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) + o_p(1)$. Therefore, $|G(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)| = o_p(1)$; that is, $|G^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{-d}) - G^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,-d})| = o_p(1)$. Since $G^*(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d})$ is locally convex at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,-d}$, it follows that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 = o_p(1)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d} = o_p(1)$. This completes the proof of (3.3).

From (A.11), Assumption 5 and the fact that $\lambda_j \leq C/(j \log j)$, we have

$$(A.25) \quad \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} (a_j + \sum_{r=1}^q w_{rj} \alpha_{0r})^2 \lambda_j \leq C m^{-2\gamma} = o(h_0^2).$$

Applying Assumption 5 and (A.25), we can easily prove that $\frac{1}{n}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})^T(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \rho(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) + o_p(h_0^2)$ in Lemma A.1, $\frac{1}{n}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta})\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(h_0^4)$ in Lemma A.3 and $\frac{1}{n}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta})(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(h_0^3)$. Consequently, it follows that $G_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(h_0^2)$ and $|G(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)| = o_p(h_0^2)$. Now (3.4) follows from Assumption 8. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma A.4. Under Assumptions 1-7, it holds that

$$\ddot{G}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d})) = 2\Omega(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}) + o_p(1),$$

where $o_p(1)$ holds uniformly for $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_{\rho_0}$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is in any bounded neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0$ and $\Omega(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) = (\pi_{kr})_{(q+d-1) \times (q+d-1)}$ with (A.26)

$$\pi_{kr} = E(V_k V_r) - E[\mathbf{B}(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) V_k]^T \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) E[\mathbf{B}(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) V_r], \quad k, r = 1, \dots, q,$$

$$(A.27) \quad \pi_{k(q+r)} = E[\dot{\mathbf{B}}_r(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) V_k]^T \bar{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + E[\mathbf{B}(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) V_k]^T \check{\mathbf{b}}_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}),$$

for $k, = 1, \dots, q; r = 1, \dots, d-1$, and

$$(A.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_{(q+k)(q+r)} &= [\bar{\mathbf{b}}^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) R_{rk}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \check{\mathbf{b}}_r^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) H_k(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})] \bar{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) - [\ddot{\Pi}_{kr}^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\ &\quad - \bar{\mathbf{b}}^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) M_{kr}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})] \bar{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \\ &\quad + [\dot{\Pi}_k^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) - \bar{\mathbf{b}}^T(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) H_k(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})] \check{\mathbf{b}}_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}), \end{aligned}$$

for $k, r = 1, \dots, d-1$, $\bar{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, $\check{\mathbf{b}}_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = -\Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) (H_r^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})) \bar{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \dot{\Pi}_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, $\dot{\Pi}_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\partial \Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \beta_r}$ and $\ddot{\Pi}_{kr}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\partial^2 \Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \beta_r \partial \beta_k}$, $M_{kr}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}')$ is a $K_n \times K_n$ matrix whose (l, l') th element is $E[B_l(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}) \ddot{B}_{l'kr}(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}')] = \frac{\partial^2 B_l(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \beta_k \partial \beta_r}$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\pi}_{kr}$ be the (k, r) th element of $\ddot{G}_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{-d}))$. From (3.6) and (3.7), we have that

$$(A.29) \quad \tilde{\pi}_{kr} = \frac{2}{n} [\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_r - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_r], \quad k, r = 1, \dots, q,$$

$$(A.30) \quad \tilde{\pi}_{k(q+r)} = \frac{2}{n} [\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r \tilde{\mathbf{b}} + \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}}_r], \quad k, = 1, \dots, q; r = 1, \dots, d-1,$$

$$(A.31) \quad \tilde{\pi}_{(q+k)(q+r)} = \frac{2}{n} (\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r \tilde{\mathbf{b}} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}}_r)^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_k \tilde{\mathbf{b}} - \frac{2}{n} (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\tilde{\mathbf{b}})^T (\ddot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_{kr} \tilde{\mathbf{b}} + \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_k \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}}_r),$$

for $k, r = 1, \dots, d-1$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k = (\tilde{W}_{1k}, \dots, \tilde{W}_{nk})^T$ for $k = 1, \dots, q$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d})$, $\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r = \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d})$, with for simplicity of notation, $\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}}_r = \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d})}{\partial \beta_r}$ and $\ddot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_{kr} = \ddot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_{kr}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d})}{\partial \beta_k \partial \beta_r}$. Since $(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} = I$, we then have

$$\frac{\partial (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1}}{\partial \beta_r} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} + (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T}{\partial \beta_r} \tilde{\mathbf{B}} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathbf{B}}}{\partial \beta_r} \right) = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\partial (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1}}{\partial \beta_r} = -(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} (\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r) (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1}.$$

Note that $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. We further have
(A.32)

$$\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{b}}}_r = -(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} [(\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r) (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) - \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r^T (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})].$$

Similar to the proof of Lemmas A.2 and A.3, we obtain that

$$(A.33) \quad \frac{1}{n} (\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r) = H_r^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(h_0^3).$$

Furthermore, under Assumption 5, Lemma A.3 yields that $\frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(h_0^4)$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 1 of Tang [29], we have $|(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} - (K_n \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))^{-1}|_\infty = o_p(h_0^3)$. By Lemma A.9 of Huang et al. [12], we also have that $\|(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1}\|_\infty \leq C$ and $\|(K_n \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))^{-1}\|_\infty \leq C$. Using (A.33), we have $\|H_r^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\|_\infty = O(1)$ and

$$(A.34) \quad \left\| \frac{1}{n} (\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r) \right\|_\infty = \|H_r^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\|_\infty + o_p(h_0^2) = O_p(1).$$

Similar to the proof of (A.20), we obtain $\frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + o_p(h_0^3)$. Observe that $\|\Pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\|_\infty = O(1)$ and hence $\|\frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})\|_\infty = O_p(1)$. Let $\vec{\mathbf{B}}_r = \frac{1}{n} (\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r)$, $\vec{H}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = H_r^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and $\vec{\mathbf{Y}} = \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \vec{\mathbf{B}}_r (\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \vec{\mathbf{Y}} - (K_n \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))^{-1} \vec{\mathbf{B}}_r (\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \vec{\mathbf{Y}}| \\ & \leq |(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} - (K_n \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))^{-1}|_\infty \|\vec{\mathbf{B}}_r\|_\infty \|(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1}\|_\infty \|\vec{\mathbf{Y}}\|_\infty \\ & = o_p(h_0^3) O_p(1) O_p(1) O_p(1) = o_p(h_0^3) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & |(K_n \Gamma(\beta, \beta))^{-1} \vec{B}_r (\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{B}^T \tilde{B})^{-1} \vec{Y} - (K_n \Gamma(\beta, \beta))^{-1} \vec{H}_r(\beta, \beta) (\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{B}^T \tilde{B})^{-1} \vec{Y}|_\infty \\ & \leq \| (K_n \Gamma(\beta, \beta))^{-1} \|_\infty \| \vec{B}_r - \vec{H}_r(\beta, \beta) \|_\infty \| (\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{B}^T \tilde{B})^{-1} \|_\infty \| \vec{Y} \|_\infty \\ & = O(1) o_p(h_0^3) O_p(1) O_p(1) = o_p(h_0^3). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it holds that

$$(A.35) \quad |(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{B}^T \tilde{B})^{-1} \vec{B}_r (\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{B}^T \tilde{B})^{-1} \vec{Y} - (K_n \Gamma(\beta, \beta))^{-1} \vec{H}_r(\beta, \beta) (K_n \Gamma(\beta, \beta))^{-1} \Pi(\alpha, \beta)|_\infty = o_p(h_0^3)$$

Under Assumption 5, similar to the proof of (A.20), we deduce that

$$(A.36) \quad \frac{1}{n} \dot{\vec{B}}_r^T (\tilde{Y} - \tilde{W}\alpha) = \dot{\Pi}_r(\alpha, \beta) + o_p(h_0^2).$$

Similar to the proof of (A.35), we further deduce that

$$(A.37) \quad |(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{B}^T \tilde{B})^{-1} (\frac{1}{n} \dot{\vec{B}}_r^T (\tilde{Y} - \tilde{W}\alpha)) - (K_n \Gamma(\beta, \beta))^{-1} \dot{\Pi}_r(\alpha, \beta)|_\infty = o_p(h_0^2).$$

Combining (A.32), (A.35) and (A.37), we then have

$$(A.38) \quad |\dot{\vec{b}}_r - \check{\vec{b}}_r(\alpha, \beta)|_\infty = o_p(h_0).$$

By arguments similar to those used in the proof of (A.35), we further have that

$$(A.39) \quad \frac{1}{n} \dot{\vec{b}}_r^T \dot{\vec{B}}_r^T \dot{\vec{B}}_k \tilde{\vec{b}} = \dot{\vec{b}}_r^T(\alpha, \beta) H_k(\beta, \beta) \bar{\vec{b}}(\alpha, \beta) + o_p(1).$$

Similar to the proof of (A.39), we obtain that

$$(A.40) \quad \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\vec{b}}^T \dot{\vec{B}}_r^T \dot{\vec{B}}_k \tilde{\vec{b}} = \bar{\vec{b}}^T(\alpha, \beta) R_{rk}(\beta, \beta) \bar{\vec{b}}(\alpha, \beta) + o_p(1),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} (\tilde{Y} - \tilde{W}\alpha - \tilde{B}\tilde{\vec{b}})^T (\ddot{\vec{B}}_{kr} \tilde{\vec{b}} + \dot{\vec{B}}_k \dot{\vec{b}}_r) \\ & = [\ddot{\Pi}_{kr}^T(\alpha, \beta) - \bar{\vec{b}}^T(\alpha, \beta) M_{kr}(\beta, \beta)] \bar{\vec{b}}(\alpha, \beta) \\ & + [\dot{\Pi}_k^T(\alpha, \beta) - \bar{\vec{b}}^T(\alpha, \beta) H_k(\beta, \beta)] \dot{\vec{b}}_r(\alpha, \beta) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Now (A.28) follows from (A.31), (A.39), (A.40) and the preceding expression. Using the fact that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{ik} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n W_{lk} \tilde{\xi}_{il})(W_{ir} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n W_{lr} \tilde{\xi}_{il}) = E(V_k V_r) + o_p(1)$, (A.26) and (A.27) can be proved in a similar fashion. This completes the proof of Lemma A.4.

Lemma A.5. Under Assumptions 1 to 3 and 5, it holds that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j [a_j - \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj})]^2 = O_p(n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} m),$$

where $\zeta_l = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} a_q \xi_{lq}$.

Proof Set $S_1 = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j [a_j - \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \xi_{lj})]^2$, $S_2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l (\hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj})]^2$ and $S_3 = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j (\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_j})^2 (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj})^2$. Note that

$$(A.41) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j [a_j - \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj})]^2 \leq 3(S_1 + S_2 + S_3).$$

Since $E[a_j - \frac{1}{\lambda_j} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \xi_{lj})] = 0$, then from Assumptions 1 to 3, we obtain

$$(A.42) \quad E(S_1) = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_j} Var(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \xi_{lj}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n^2 \lambda_j} \sum_{l=1}^n E(\zeta_l^2 \xi_{lj}^2) \leq Cm/n.$$

Similar to the proof of (A.6), (A.7) and using Assumption 5, we deduce that

$$(A.43) \quad S_2 = O_p(n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-2} m^3 \log m + n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} m) = O_p(n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} m)$$

and

$$(A.44) \quad \begin{aligned} S_3 &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)^2}{\lambda_j^3} \left(\bar{\zeta}_j^2 + [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l (\hat{\xi}_{lj} - \xi_{lj})]^2 \right) [1 + o_p(1)] \\ &= O_p(n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} + n^{-3} \lambda_m^{-4} m^3 \log m + n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-3} m) = O_p(n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma A.5 follows from combining (A.41) to (A.44).

Lemma A.6. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_i) &= \frac{\partial g_0(Z_i^T \beta)}{\partial \beta_r} |_{\beta=\beta_0} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} b_{0k} B'_k(Z_i^T \beta_0) \left(Z_{ir} - \frac{\beta_{0r} Z_{id}}{\sqrt{1 - (\beta_{01}^2 + \dots + \beta_{0(d-1)}^2)}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $r = 1, \dots, d-1$ and $A_{ri} = \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) \tilde{\xi}_{il}$. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 4 and 5, it holds that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri} \right)^2 = O_p(nm + \lambda_m^{-2} m^4 \log m).$$

Proof Let $A_{ri}^* = \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_i) - \sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) \xi_{lj'}) \xi_{ij'}$. Observe that

(A.45)

$$\begin{aligned} (\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri}^*)^2 &\leq 4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri}^* \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} \sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) (\hat{\xi}_{lj'} - \xi_{lj'}) \right] \xi_{ij'} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} \sum_{j'=1}^m \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \right) \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) \hat{\xi}_{lj'} \right] \xi_{ij'} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + 4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} \sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) \hat{\xi}_{lj'} \right] (\hat{\xi}_{ij'} - \xi_{ij'}) \right)^2 \\ &=: 4(T_{j1} + T_{j2} + T_{j3} + T_{j4}). \end{aligned}$$

By direct computations and using Assumption 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E(\xi_{ij}^2 A_{ri}^{*2}) &\leq 2E(\xi_{ij}^2 \dot{g}_{0r}^2(Z_i)) + 2E[\xi_{ij}^2 (\sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) \xi_{lj'}) \xi_{ij'})^2] \\ &\leq C(\lambda_j + m\lambda_j/n^2 + (n-1)m\lambda_j/n^2 + m^2\lambda_j/n^2) \leq C\lambda_j \end{aligned}$$

and

$$| \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} E(\xi_{i_1 j} \xi_{i_2 j} A_{ri_1}^* A_{ri_2}^*) | \leq C[(n-1)(n+2)\lambda_j/n + (n-1)m\lambda_j/n] \leq Cn\lambda_j.$$

Hence, it follows that

$$(A.46) \quad E(T_{j1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n E(\xi_{ij}^2 A_{ri}^{*2}) + \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} E(\xi_{i_1 j} \xi_{i_2 j} A_{ri_1}^* A_{ri_2}^*) \leq Cn\lambda_j.$$

Similar to the proof of (A.6) and using Assumption 1, we have

$$\sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) (\hat{\xi}_{lj'} - \xi_{lj'}) \right]^2 = O_p(n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-2} m^3 \log m).$$

Since $\sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} E(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} \xi_{ij'})^2 \leq Cn^2 \lambda_j$, then

(A.47)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-1} T_{j2} &\leq \left(\sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) (\hat{\xi}_{lj'} - \xi_{lj'}) \right]^2 \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-1} \sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} (\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} \xi_{ij'})^2 \right) \\ &= O_p(n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-2} m^3 \log m) O_p(n^2 m) = O_p(\lambda_m^{-2} m^4 \log m). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof (A.7) and using Assumption 5, we deduce that

(A.48)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-1} T_{j3} &\leq \left(\sum_{j'=1}^m \lambda_{j'} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} - \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \right)^2 \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) \hat{\xi}_{lj'} \right]^2 \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-1} \sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}} (\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} \xi_{ij'})^2 \right) \\ &= O_p(\lambda_m^{-2} m^2 + n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-4} m^4 \log m) = O_p(\lambda_m^{-2} m^2 \log m). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-1} T_{j4} &\leq \left(\sum_{j'=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_{j'}^2} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) \hat{\xi}_{lj'} \right]^2 \right) [1 + o_p(1)] \\
 (A.49) \quad &\times \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j'=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\xi}_{ij'} - \xi_{ij'})^2 \right) \\
 &= O_p(n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} m^5 \log m + n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-3} m^7 (\log m)^2) \\
 &= o_p(\lambda_m^{-2} m^4 \log m).
 \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma A.6 follows from combining (A.45)-(A.49) and Assumption 5.

Lemma A.7. Under the Assumptions 1-3 and 5, it holds that

$$n^{-1/2} \left| \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij}) A_{ri} \right| = o_p(1).$$

Proof Let $\check{\zeta}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj}$. Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} \check{\zeta}_j \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij}) A_{ri} \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j^2} \check{\zeta}_j^2 \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij}) A_{ri} \right)^2.$$

Using (A.4), (A.5), Assumption 5, Parseval's identity and some arguments similar to those used to prove Lemma A.6, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{j=1}^m \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij}) A_{ri} \right)^2 \\
 &\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\left(\sum_{k \neq j} (\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_k)^{-1} \int \Delta \hat{\phi}_j \phi_k \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ik} A_{ri} \right)^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri} \right)^2 \left(\int (\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j) \phi_j \right)^2 \right] \\
 &\leq C \|\Delta\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\sum_{k \neq j} (\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_k)^{-2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ik} A_{ri} \right)^2 + \lambda_j^{-2} j^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri} \right)^2 \right] \\
 &= O_p(\lambda_m^{-1} m^3 \log m + n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-3} m^6 \log m) = o_p(n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (A.7) and using Assumption 5, we obtain that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j^2} \check{\zeta}_j^2 = O_p(n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-1} m + 1 + n^{-2} \lambda_m^{-3} m^3 \log m + n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-2} m) = o_p(1).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma A.7.

Lemma A.8. Set $\tilde{\zeta}_i = \zeta_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \tilde{\xi}_{il}$. Under Assumptions 1-4 and 5, it holds that

$$n^{-1/2} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\zeta}_i A_{ri} \right| = o_p(1).$$

Proof Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\zeta}_i A_{ri} &= \sum_{j=1}^m \left[a_j - \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj} \right) \right] \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri} \\
 (A.50) \quad &- \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}_j} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij}) A_{ri} \\
 &+ \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} a_j \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Lemmas A.5, A.6 and Assumption 5 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A.51) \quad & n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^m [a_j - \frac{1}{\lambda_j} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj})] \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri} \right| \\
 & \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j [a_j - \frac{1}{\lambda_j} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \zeta_l \hat{\xi}_{lj})]^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j^{-1} (\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri})^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & = O_p(n^{-1/2} \lambda_m^{-1/2} m + n^{-1} \lambda_m^{-3/2} m^{5/2} (\log m)^{1/2}) = o_p(1).
 \end{aligned}$$

By arguments similar to those used in the proof of Lemma A.6 and using Lemma 6.1 of Cardot et al. [5], we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A.52) \quad & (\sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} a_j \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri})^2 \\
 & \leq (\sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} a_j^2) (\sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} (\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{ij} A_{ri})^2) \\
 & = O_p(nm^{-2\gamma+1} + \lambda_m^{-2} m^{-2\gamma+4} \log m) \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \\
 & = o_p(n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma A.8 follows from combining (A.50)-(A.52) and Lemma A.7.

Lemma A.9. Suppose that Assumptions 1-5 hold. Then

$$n^{-1/2} (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0)^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0 = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_i) \varepsilon_i + o_p(1).$$

Proof Using arguments similar to those used to prove Lemmas A.6 and A.7, we deduce that $\sum_{i=1}^n A_{ri}^2 = O_p(n)$, $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_l) \tilde{\xi}_{il}) = o_p(1)$ and

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \varepsilon_l \tilde{\xi}_{il} \right) A_{ri} = o_p(1), \quad n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n R(Z_l^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\xi}_{il} \right) A_{ri} = o_p(1).$$

Hence

$$(A.53) \quad n^{-1/2} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0 = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{g}_{0r}(Z_i) \varepsilon_i + o_p(1).$$

Using (3.1) and the assumption $nh^{2p} \rightarrow 0$, it follows that $(\sum_{i=1}^n R(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) A_{ri})^2 \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n R^2(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) (\sum_{i=1}^n A_{ri}^2) = o_p(n)$. Consequently, we have

$$(A.54) \quad n^{-1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{R}}^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0 = o_p(1),$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = (\tilde{R}(Z_1^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), \dots, \tilde{R}(Z_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^T$ and $\tilde{R}(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = R(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n R(Z_l^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\xi}_{il}$. Now Lemma A.9 follows from Lemma A.8, (A.53) and (A.54).

Lemma A.10. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0 \\ &= n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0 + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = (\mathbf{B}(Z_1^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), \dots, \mathbf{B}(Z_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^T$.

Proof Note that $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \mathbf{b}_0 = (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0)$. By (A.33), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty &= |H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty + o_p(h_0^2) \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq K_n} E[B_k(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) |\dot{g}_{0r}(Z)|] + o_p(h_0^2) \\ &= O_p(h_0) \end{aligned}$$

Similar to Lemma A.9, we have $\|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\|_\infty = o_p(1)$ and $\|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\|_\infty = O_p(K_n^{1/2})$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-\frac{1}{2}} |(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0| \\ &\leq K_n \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\|_\infty \|(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^{-1}\|_\infty \\ &\times |\frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty = K_n o_p(1) O_p(1) O_p(h_0) = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Using arguments similar to those used in the proof of (A.35), we can deduce that

$$|(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0 - \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty = o_p(h_0).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & |n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) [(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0 - \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0]| \\ &\leq \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\|_\infty |(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0 - \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty \\ &= O_p(K_n^{1/2}) o_p(h_0) = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Using arguments similar to those used to prove Lemmas A.6 and A.7, we deduce that

$$\|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0))\|_\infty = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n B_k(Z_l^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\xi}_{il} \right] \right| = o_p(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & |n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0| \\ &\leq K_n \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0))\|_\infty \|(K_n \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))^{-1}\|_\infty |H_r(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty \\ &= K_n o_p(1) O_p(1) O_p(h_0) = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma A.10.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. From Lemma A.4 and Assumption 8, we have

(A.55)

$$\ddot{G}_n(\beta_{-d}^*, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\beta_{-d}^*)) = 2\Omega(\beta_{-d}^*) + o_p(1) = 2\Omega(\beta_{0,-d}) + o_p(1) = 2\Omega_0 + o_p(1).$$

Note that $(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0))^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$ can be written as

(A.56)

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0))^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \\ &= (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0 - (\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_0)\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0 \\ &+ (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0) \\ &- (\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_0)\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to Lemma A.9, we have $\|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)\|_\infty = O_p(K_n^{3/2})$ and $|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)|_\infty = O_p(h_0^{1/2})$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & |\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty \leq \frac{K_n}{n} \|(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_0) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0))^{-1}\|_\infty \\ & |\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_0)(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)|_\infty \\ &= O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}h_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Further, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-\frac{1}{2}}|(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0)| \\ (A.57) \quad & \leq \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\alpha_0 - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)^T \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)\|_\infty |\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty \\ &= O_p(n^{-1/2}h_0^{-2}) = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (A.34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-\frac{1}{2}}|(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_0)\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0)| \\ (A.58) \quad & \leq n^{\frac{1}{2}}K_n \|\frac{1}{n}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_0)\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_0)\|_\infty |\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0|_\infty^2 \\ &= O_p(n^{-1/2}h_0^{-2}) = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Now $(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\hat{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\beta}_{-d})\hat{\mathbf{b}})^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\hat{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\beta}_{-d})\hat{\mathbf{b}})^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \\ &= (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\hat{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k - (\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) - \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_0)\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \end{aligned}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, q$. Similar to the proof of Lemma A.9, we deduce that

$$n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\hat{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_0)\mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k + o_p(1).$$

We decompose $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k$ into three terms as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k &= \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \left(W_{ik} - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{E(W_{lk}\xi_j)}{\lambda_j} \xi_{ij} \right) - \\ &\quad \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\xi_{ij}}{\lambda_j} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n W_{lk} \xi_{lj} - E(W_{lk}\xi_j) \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n W_{lk} (\tilde{\xi}_{il} - \tilde{\xi}_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma A.8, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n W_{lk} (\tilde{\xi}_{il} - \tilde{\xi}_{ij}) = o_p(n)$. Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \left(W_{ik} - \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{E(W_{lk}\xi_j)}{\lambda_j} \xi_{ij} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i V_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} w_{kj} \xi_{ij},$$

$\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\xi_{ij}}{\lambda_j} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n W_{lk} \xi_{lj} - E(W_{lk}\xi_j) \right) = o_p(n)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} w_{kj} \xi_{ij} = o_p(n)$, it follows that $n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \mathbf{V}_k + o_p(1)$, where $\mathbf{V}_k = (V_{1k}, \dots, V_{nk})^T$. Similar to the proof of Lemma A.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \mathbf{b}_0)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \\ &= n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) E(\mathbf{B}(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) W_k) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (A.59) \quad &n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d})\hat{\mathbf{b}})^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_k \\ &= n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^T (\mathbf{V}_k - \mathbf{B}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \Gamma^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) E(\mathbf{B}(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) W_k)) + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Now (3.9) follows from (A.55)-(A.59), Lemmas A.9 and A.10, and the Central Limit Theorem. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Lemma A.11. Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.3, it holds that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \mathbf{b}_0\|^2 = O_p(n^{-1} K_n^2).$$

Proof. From Assumption 6 and Lemma A.3, all the eigenvalues of $(\frac{K_n}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))^{-1}$ are bounded away from zero and infinity, except possibly on an event whose probability tends to zero. We then have

$$(A.60) \quad \|\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \mathbf{b}_0\|^2 \leq CK_n^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\mathbf{b}_0)\|^2 / n^2,$$

where $\|a\| = (a_1^2 + \dots + a_k^2)^{1/2}$ for a vector $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k)^T$. Let $\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}) (\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d})\mathbf{b}_0)$. By a Taylor expansion, we have that

$$(A.61) \quad \mathbf{F}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}) = \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}) - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}^*) \tilde{\mathbf{W}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0) + \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}^*} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}),$$

where $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{*T}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}^{*T})^T$ is between $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^T, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d}^T)^T$ and $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0^T, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}^T)^T$, and

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial \beta_r} \right|_{\beta_{-d}=\beta_{-d}^*} = \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r^T(\beta_{-d}^*)(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^* - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_{-d}^*)\mathbf{b}_0) - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_{-d}^*)\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta_{-d}^*)\mathbf{b}_0.$$

Similar to the proof of (A.33) and (A.36), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n} \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r^T(\beta_{-d}^*)(\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^* - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\beta_{-d}^*)\mathbf{b}_0) \right\|^2 \\ &= \|E[\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{-d}^*)V^T](\boldsymbol{\alpha}^* - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0)\|^2 + o_p(1) = o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

and $\left\| \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta^*)\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}}_r(\beta^*)\mathbf{b}_0 \right\|^2 = O_p(1)$. From Theorem 3.2, it holds that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d}\|^2 = O_p(n^{-1})$. Hence

(A.62)

$$\left\| \left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial \beta_{-d}} \right|_{\beta_{-d}=\beta_{-d}^*} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-d} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,d}) \right\|^2 \leq \sum_{r=1}^{d-1} \left\| \left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial \beta_r} \right|_{\beta_{-d}=\beta_{-d}^*} \right\|^2 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 = o_p(n).$$

It is easy to prove that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T(\beta_{-d}^*)\tilde{\mathbf{W}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0)\|^2 = o_p(n)$. By arguments similar to those used to prove Lemma A.9, we can prove that $\|\mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-d})\|^2 = O_p(n)$. Now Lemma A.11 follows from (A.60)-(A.62). This completes the proof of Lemma A.11.

Lemma A.12. Define $\check{a}_j = \frac{1}{\lambda_j} E[(Y - W^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - g(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))\xi_j]$. Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.3, it holds that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} (\hat{a}_j - \check{a}_j)^2 = O_p(n^{-1} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1} + n^{-2} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} a_j^2 \lambda_j^{-2} j^3).$$

Proof. Note that $E[(Y - W^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - g(Z^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))\xi_j] = a_j \lambda_j$. Define $I_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - W_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)] \xi_{ij} - a_j \lambda_j$, $I_2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - W_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)] (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij})$ and $I_3 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [W_i^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0) + (\hat{g}(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))] \hat{\xi}_{ij}$. Then we have

$$(A.63) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} (\hat{a}_j - \check{a}_j)^2 \leq 3 \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-2} (I_1^2 + I_2^2 + I_3^2) [1 + o_p(1)],$$

where $o_p(1)$ holds uniformly for $j = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}$. Since $E(I_1) = 0$ and $E(I_1^2) \leq \frac{1}{n} [\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^2 E(\xi_k^2 \xi_j^2) + \sigma^2 \lambda_j] \leq C \lambda_j / n$, we obtain that

$$(A.64) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-2} I_1^2 = O_p(n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-1}) = O_p(n^{-1} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1}).$$

Let $M(t) = E[(Y_i - W_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))X_i(t)] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \lambda_k \phi_k(t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} I_2^2 &\leq 2 \int_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - W_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)] X_i(t) - M(t) \right)^2 dt \|\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \left(\int_{\mathcal{T}} M(t) (\hat{\phi}_j(t) - \phi_j(t)) dt \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Assumption 1, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left(\int_{\mathcal{T}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - W_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)] X_i(t) - M(t) \right)^2 dt \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathcal{T}} E([Y_i - W_i^T \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0 - g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)]^2 X_i^2(t)) dt = O(n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

From (A.8), we obtain $\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-2} \|\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|^2 = O_p(n^{-1} \tilde{m}^3 \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-2} \log \tilde{m})$. By arguments similar to those used in the proof of (5.15) of Hall and Horowitz [10], it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-2} \left(\int_{\mathcal{T}} M(t) (\hat{\phi}_j(t) - \phi_j(t)) dt \right)^2 \\ &= O_p\left(\frac{\tilde{m}}{n \lambda_{\tilde{m}}} + \frac{\tilde{m}}{n^2 \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^2} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} a_j^2 \lambda_j^{-2} j^3 + \frac{\tilde{m}^3 \log \tilde{m}}{n^2 \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the assumption that $n^{-1/2} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}} \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$(A.65) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-2} I_2^2 = O_p(n^{-1} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1} + n^{-2} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} a_j^2 \lambda_j^{-2} j^3).$$

Define $I_{31} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\hat{g}(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g_0(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})] \hat{\xi}_{ij}$, $I_{32} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [W_i^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0) + (g_0(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))] \hat{\xi}_{ij}$, $L_j = (l_{jkk'})_{K_n \times K_n}$ with $l_{jkk'} = (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_k(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \hat{\xi}_{ij}) (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_{k'}(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \hat{\xi}_{ij})$. We write $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_k(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \hat{\xi}_{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [B_k(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \xi_{ij} + (B_k(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - B_k(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) \xi_{ij} + B_k(Z_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij})]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |L_j|_{\infty} &= \max_{k,k'} |l_{jkk'}| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_k(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \xi_{ij} \right)^2 + \frac{C}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [h_0^{-2} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|^2 \xi_{ij}^2 + (\hat{\xi}_{ij} - \xi_{ij})^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Simple calculations yield $\sum_{k=1}^{K_n} E \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_k(Z_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \xi_{ij} \right)^2 \leq C n^{-1} \lambda_j$. Applying Lemma A.11, we obtain that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \mathbf{b}_0\|_{\infty}^2 \leq K_n \|\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \mathbf{b}_0\|^2 = O_p(n^{-1} K_n^3)$. Hence, under the assumptions of Theorem 3.3, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (A.66) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-2} I_{31}^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \mathbf{b}_0\|_{\infty}^2 \cdot |L_j|_{\infty} \\ &= O_p(n^{-2} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1} h_0^{-3} + n^{-2} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1} h_0^{-5} + n^{-2} \tilde{m}^3 \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-2} h_0^{-3} \log \tilde{m}) \\ &= O_p(n^{-1} \tilde{m} \lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Using a Taylor expansion, Theorem 3.2, and the assumption that $nh_0^{2p} \rightarrow 0$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \lambda_j^{-2} I_{32}^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{n\lambda_j^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\xi}_{ij}^2 \right) \\
 &\quad \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [W_i^T(\hat{\alpha} - \alpha_0) + (g_0(Z_i^T \hat{\beta}) - g(Z_i^T \beta_0))]^2 \right) \\
 (A.67) \quad &= O_p(\tilde{m}\lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1} + n^{-1}\tilde{m}^3\lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-2} \log \tilde{m}) O_p(n^{-1} + h_0^{2p}) \\
 &= O_p(n^{-1}\tilde{m}\lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma A.12 follows from combining (A.63)-(A.67).

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\mathcal{T}} [\hat{a}(t) - a(t)]^2 dt &\leq C \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} (\hat{a}_j - \check{a}_j)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} (\check{a}_j - a_j)^2 + \right. \\
 (A.68) \quad &\quad \left. \tilde{m} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} a_j^2 \|\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|^2 + \sum_{j=\tilde{m}+1}^{\infty} a_j^2 \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A.69) \quad &\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} (\check{a}_j - a_j)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{(\hat{\lambda}_j - \lambda_j)^2}{\lambda_j^2} a_j^2 [1 + o_p(1)] = O_p(n^{-1}\lambda_{\tilde{m}}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} a_j^2 \lambda_j^{-1}).
 \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 3 implies that $\tilde{m} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} a_j^2 \|\hat{\phi}_j - \phi_j\|^2 = O_p(\tilde{m}n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} a_j^2 j^2 \log j) = o_p(\tilde{m}/n)$ and $\sum_{j=\tilde{m}+1}^{\infty} a_j^2 = O(\tilde{m}^{-2\gamma+1})$. Now (3.10) follows from Lemma A.12, (A.68) and (A.69). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. From Assumption 6 and Lemma A.3, all the eigenvalues of $(\frac{K_n^*}{n} \mathbf{B}^{*T}(\hat{\beta}) \mathbf{B}^*(\hat{\beta}))^{-1}$ are bounded away from zero and infinity, except possibly on an event whose probability tends to zero. Similar to (3.1), there exists a spline function $g^*(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_n^*} b_{0k}^* B_k^*(u)$ such that

$$(A.70) \quad \sup_{u \in [U_{\beta_0}, U^{\beta_0}]} |g(u) - g^*(u)| \leq Ch^p.$$

Let $\mathbf{b}_0^* = (b_{01}^*, \dots, b_{0K_n^*}^*)^T$. Using the properties of B-splines (de Boor 1978), we obtain

$$(A.71) \quad \int_{U_{\beta_0}}^{U^{\beta_0}} (\hat{g}(u) - g(u))^2 du \leq C(\|\mathbf{b}^*(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) - \mathbf{b}_0^*\|^2 / K_n^* + h^{2p}).$$

Using arguments similar to those used to prove Lemma A.11 and using the fact that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K_n^*} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n B_k^*(Z_i \beta_0) R^*(Z_i \beta_0) \right)^2 = O_p(n^2 h^{2p+1}),$$

where $R^*(u) = g(u) - \sum_{k=1}^{K_n^*} b_{0k}^* B_k^*(u)$, one can prove that

$$(A.72) \quad \|\mathbf{b}^*(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \mathbf{b}_0^*\|^2 = O_p(n^{-1} K_n^{*2}) + O_p(h^{2p-1}).$$

Now (3.12) follows from (A.71) and the fact that $h = O(K_n^{*-1})$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Observe that

$$(A.73) \quad \text{MSPE} \leq 3\{\|\hat{a} - a\|_K^2 + (\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0)^T E(WW^T)(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}_0) + E([\hat{g}(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)]^2 | \mathcal{S})\},$$

where $\|\hat{a} - a\|_K^2 = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \int_{\mathcal{T}} K(s, t) [\hat{a}(s) - a(s)][\hat{a}(t) - a(t)] ds dt$. Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.5, using arguments similar to those used in the proof of Theorem 2 of Tang (2015), we deduce that

$$(A.74) \quad \|\hat{a} - a\|_K^2 = O_p(n^{-(\delta+2\gamma-1)/(\delta+2\gamma)}).$$

Write

$$\hat{g}(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = \hat{g}(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g^*(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + g^*(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0).$$

Using a Taylor expansion, Theorems 3.2 and 3.4, (A.71), and the property of B-spline function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & E([\hat{g}(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g^*(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})]^2 | \mathcal{S}) \\ & \leq 2E([\hat{g}(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - g^*(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)]^2 | \mathcal{S}) \\ & \quad + Ch^{-2}(\sum_{k=1}^{K_n^*} |\hat{b}_k - b_{0k}^*|)^2 (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^T E(ZZ^T)(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\ & = O_p(n^{-\frac{2p}{2p+1}}) + O_p(n^{-2}h^{-5} + n^{-1}h^{2p-4}) = O_p(n^{-\frac{2p}{2p+1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Using a Taylor expansion, Theorem 3.2 and (A.70), we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E([g^*(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)]^2 | \mathcal{S}) & \leq 2E([g^*(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - g(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)]^2 | \mathcal{S}) \\ & \quad + C(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^T E(ZZ^T)(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = O_p(h^{2p}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $E([\hat{g}(Z_{n+1}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g(Z_{n+1}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)]^2 | \mathcal{S}) = O_p(n^{-2p/(2p+1)})$. Now (3.14) follows from (A.73), (A.74) and Theorem 3.2. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.5.

Acknowledgments. Part of data collection and sharing for this project was funded by the Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (National Institutes of Health Grant U01 AG024904). ADNI is funded by the National Institute on Aging, the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering, and through generous contributions from the following: Alzheimer’s Association; Alzheimer’s Drug Discovery Foundation; BioClinica, Inc.; Biogen Idec Inc.; Bristol-Myers Squibb Company; Eisai Inc.; Elan Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Eli Lilly and Company; F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd and its affiliated company Genentech, Inc.; GE Healthcare; Innogenetics, N.V.; IXICO Ltd.; Janssen Alzheimer Immunotherapy Research & Development, LLC.; Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceutical Research & Development LLC.; Medpace, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; Meso Scale Diagnostics, LLC.; NeuroRx Research; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation; Pfizer Inc.; Piramal Imaging; Servier; Synarc Inc.; and Takeda Pharmaceutical Company. The Canadian Institutes of Health Research is providing funds to support ADNI clinical sites in Canada. Private sector contributions are facilitated by the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health (www.fnih.org). The grantee organization is the Northern California Institute for Research and Education, and the study is coordinated by the Alzheimer’s Disease Cooperative Study at the University of California, San Diego. ADNI data are disseminated by the Laboratory for Neuro Imaging at the University of California, Los Angeles.

REFERENCES

- [1] Basser, P. J., Mattiello, J., and LeBihan, D. (1994). MR diffusion tensor spectroscopy and imaging. *Biophysical journal*. **66** (1), 259-267.
- [2] Basser, P.J. and Pierpaoli, C. (1996). Microstructural and physiological features of tissues elucidated by quantitative-diffusion-tensor MRI. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance, Series B*. **111**, 209-219.
- [3] Cai, T. T. and Hall, P. (2006). Prediction in functional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.* **34**, 2159-2179.
- [4] Carroll, R. J., Fan, J., Gijbels, I. and Wand, M. P. (1997). Generalized partially linear single-index models. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **92**, 477-489.
- [5] Cardot, H., Mas, A. and Sarda, P. (2007). CLT in functional linear models. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **138**, 325-361.
- [6] Chen, D., Hall, P. and Müller, H. G. (2011). Single and multiple index functional regression models with nonparametric link. *Ann. Statist.* **39**, 1720-1747.
- [7] Chen, K. and Müller, H.-G. (2012). Conditional quantile analysis when covariates are functions, with application to growth data. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B* **74**, 67-89.
- [8] Delaigle, A. and Hall, P. (2012). Methodology and theory for partial least squares applied to functional data. *Ann. Statist.* **40**, 322-352.
- [9] Ferraty, F. and Vieu, P. (2006). *Nonparametric Functional Data Analysis*. Springer, New York.

- [10] Hall, P. and Horowitz, J. L. (2007). Methodology and convergence rates for functional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.* **35**, 70-91.
- [11] Horváth, L. and Kokoszka, P. (2012). *Inference for Functional Data with Applications*. Springer, New York.
- [12] Huang, J. Z., Wu, C. O. and Zhou, L. (2004). Polynomial spline estimation and inference for Varying coefficient models with longitudinal data. *Statist. Sin.* **14**, 763-788.
- [13] Kato, K. (2012). Estimation in functional linear quantile regression. *Ann. Statist.* **40**, 3108-3136.
- [14] Koenker, R., (2005). *Quantile Regression*. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- [15] Li, J., Huang, C., and Zhu, H. (2016). A functional varying-coefficient single index model for functional response data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, to appear.
- [16] Liang, H., Liu, X., Li, R. and Tsai, C. L. (2010). Estimation and testing for partially linear single-index models. *Ann. Statist.* **38**, 3811-3836.
- [17] Llano, D. A., Laforet, G., and Devanarayan, V. (2011). Derivation of a new ADAS-cog composite using tree-based multivariate analysis: prediction of conversion from mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer disease. *Alzheimer Disease & Associated Disorders* **25**(1), 73-84.
- [18] Liu, C. C., Kanekiyo, T., Xu, H., and Bu, G. (2013). Apolipoprotein E and Alzheimer disease: risk, mechanisms and therapy. *Nature Reviews Neurology* **9**(2), 106-118.
- [19] Ma, S. (2016). Estimation and inference in functional single-index models. *Ann. Inst. Stat. Math.* **68**, 181-208.
- [20] Müller, H.-G. and Stadtmüller, U. (2005). Generalized functional linear models. *Ann. Statist.* **33**, 774-805.
- [21] O'Bryant, S. E., Humphreys, J. D., Smith, G. E., Ivnik, R. J., Graff-Radford, N. R., Petersen, R. C., and Lucas, J. A. (2008). Detecting dementia with the mini-mental state examination (MMSE) in Highly Educated Individuals. *Archives of Neurology* **65**(7), 963-967.
- [22] Podhorna, J., Krahne, T., Shear, M., and Harrison, J. (2016). Alzheimer's disease assessment scale cognitive subscale variants in mild cognitive impairment and mild Alzheimer's disease: change over time and the effect of enrichment strategies. *Alzheimer's research & therapy*, **8**(1), 8.
- [23] Pöysti, M. M., Laakkonen, M. L., Strandberg, T., Savikko, N., Tilvis, R. S., Eloniemi-Sulkava, U., and Pitkälä, K. H. (2012). Gender differences in dementia spousal caregiving. *International Journal of Alzheimer's disease*, url: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2012/162960>.
- [24] Ramsay, J. O. and Silverman, B. W. (2002). *Applied Functional Data Analysis: Methods and Case Studies*. Springer, New York.
- [25] Ramsay, J. O. and Silverman, B. W. (2005). *Functional Data Analysis*. Springer, New York.
- [26] Shin, H. (2009). Partial functional linear regression. *J. Statist. Plan. Infer.* **139**, 3405-3418.
- [27] Shin, H. and Lee, M. H. (2012). On prediction rate in partial functional linear regression. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **103**, 93-106.
- [28] Smith, S.M., Jenkinson, E., Johansen-Berg, D., Rueckert, D., Nichols, T.E., Mackay, C.E., Watkins, K.E., Ciccarelli, O., Cader, M.Z., Matthews, P.M., et al. (2006). Tract-based spatial statistics: voxelwise analysis of multi-subject diffusion data. *Neuroimage* **31**(4), 1487-1505.

- [29] Tang, Q. (2013). B-spline estimation for semiparametric varying-coefficient partially linear regression with spatial data. *J. Nonparam. Stat.* **25** 361-378.
- [30] Tang, Q. and Cheng, L. (2014). Partial functional linear quantile regression. *Science China Mathematics* **57**(12), 2589-2608.
- [31] Tombaugh, T.N. and McIntyre, N.J. (1992). The mini-mental state examination: a comprehensive review. *J. Amer. Geriatr. Soc.* **40**, 922-935.
- [32] Wang, Guochang, Fang, Xiang-Nan and Chen, Min (2016). Functional partial linear single index model. *Scand. J. Statist.* **43**, 261-274.
- [33] Wang, J. L., Xue, L. G., Zhu, L. X. and Chong, Y. S. (2010). Partial-linear single-index model with noised variable. *Ann. Statist.* **38**, 246-272.
- [34] Xia, Y. C. and Härdle, W. (2006). Semi-parametric estimation of partially linear single-index models. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **97**, 1162-1184.
- [35] Xia, Y., Tong, H. and Li, W. K. (1999). On extended partially linear single-index models. *Biometrika* **86**, 831-842.
- [36] Yao, F., Müller, H. G. and Wang, J. L. (2005). Functional linear regression analysis for longitudinal data. *Ann. Statist.* **33**, 2873-2903.
- [37] Yu, D. Kong, L. and Mizera, I. (2016). Partial functional linear quantile regression for neuroimaging data analysis. *Neurocomputing* **195**, 74-87.
- [38] Yu, Y. and Ruppert, D. (2002). Penalized spline estimation for partially linear single-index models. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **97**, 1042-1054.
- [39] Yuan, M. and Cai, T. T. (2010). A reproducing kernel hilbert space approach to functional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.* **38**, 3412-3444.
- [40] Zhu, H., Zhang, H., Ibrahim, J.G., and Peterson, B.S. (2006). Statistical analysis of diffusion tensors in diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **102**, 1085-1102.
- [41] Zhu, H., Li, R. and Kong, L. (2012). Multivariate varying coefficient model for functional responses. *Ann. Statist.* **40**, 2634-2666.
- [42] Zhou, B., Nakatani, E., Teramukai, S., Nagai, Y., and Fukushima, M. (2012). Risk classification in mild cognitive impairment patients for developing Alzheimer's disease. *Journal of Alzheimer's Disease* **30**(2), 367-375.

SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT
 NANJING UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
 NANJING, JIANGSU 210094
 CHINA
 E-MAIL: tangqguo@163.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL
 AND STATISTICAL SCIENCES
 UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
 EDMONTON, AB T6G 2G1
 CANADA
 E-MAIL: lkong@ualberta.ca
R.J.Karunamuni@ualberta.ca

SCHOOL OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH AND INFORMATION ENGINEERING
 CORNELL UNIVERSITY
 ITHACA, NY 14853
 USA
 E-MAIL: dr24@cornell.edu