

Common change point estimation in panel data from the least squares and maximum likelihood viewpoints

Monika Bhattacharjee¹, Moulinath Banerjee² and George Michailidis³

¹Informatics Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

²Department of Statistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA

³Department of Statistics & Informatics Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

November 15, 2021

Abstract

We establish the convergence rates and asymptotic distributions of the common break change-point-estimators, obtained by least squares and maximum likelihood in panel data models and compare their asymptotic variances. Our model assumptions accommodate a variety of commonly encountered probability distributions and, in particular, models of particular interest in econometrics beyond the commonly analyzed Gaussian model, including the zero-inflated Poisson model for count data, and the probit and tobit models. We also provide novel results for time dependent data in the signal-plus-noise model, with emphasis on a wide array of noise processes, including Gaussian process, $MA(\infty)$ and m -dependent processes. The obtained results show that maximum likelihood estimation requires a stronger signal-to-noise model identifiability condition compared to its least squares counterpart. Finally, since there are three different asymptotic regimes that depend on the behavior of the norm difference of the model parameters before and after the change point, which cannot be realistically assumed to be known, we develop a novel *data driven adaptive procedure* that provides valid confidence intervals for the common break, without requiring a priori knowledge of the asymptotic regime the problem falls in.

Key words and phrases. panel data, change point, least squares estimator, maximum likelihood estimator, adaptive estimation

1 Introduction

The change point problem for univariate data has a long history in the econometrics and statistics literature. A broad overview of the technical aspects of the problem is provided in [Basseville and Nikiforov \(1993\)](#); [Csörgö and Horváth \(1997\)](#). The problem has a wide range of applications in economics ([Baltagi et al., 2016](#); [Liangjun and Qian, 2015](#); [Li et al., 2016](#)) and finance ([Frisén, 2008](#)), while other standard areas include quality monitoring and control ([Qiu, 2013](#)), as well as newer ones such as genetics and medicine ([Chen and Gupta, 2011](#)) and neuroscience ([Koepcke et al., 2016](#)). On the other hand, there is little work when it comes to panel data, despite the presence of common break in such data as argued in [Bai \(2010\)](#). Further, most of the analytical emphasis is on numerical/continuous data, although there are a lot of applications involving count data (see ([Cameron et al., 2013](#); [Hsiao, 2014](#)) and references therein) and binary data ([Park, 2011](#); [Wu and Yang, 2008](#)) or categorical data ([Zhang et al., 2010](#)).

The technical literature on change point analysis for panel data focuses on the common break model given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_{it} &= \mu_{i1} + \epsilon_{it}, & t = 1, 2, \dots, \tau \\ X_{it} &= \mu_{i2} + \epsilon_{it}, & t = \tau + 1, \dots, T \\ i &= 1, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where τ represents a common break point for all N series, the difference $|\mu_{i1} - \mu_{i2}|$ represents the magnitude of the shift for each series and ϵ_{it} are random noise processes that are cross-sectionally independent. [Bai \(2010\)](#) employed a least squares criterion to estimate the common change point τ and established its asymptotic distribution, while [Horváth and Hušková \(2012\)](#) developed tests for the presence of a change point during the observation period. [Kim \(2014\)](#) investigated estimation of the change point under cross-sectional dependence in panels modeled by a common factor (see also ([Baltagi et al., 2016](#))).

As previously mentioned, the focus in the literature has been on the estimation of the common change point based on the mean shift model using a least squares criterion. However, for other

types of data, such as count data that can be modeled by Poisson or negative binomial models and their zero inflated counterparts (Cameron et al., 2013), maximum likelihood estimation is a more suitable procedure. The same holds true for more complex models such as probit or Tobit models (Park, 2011). To emphasize the latter point, consider a zero-inflated Poisson model characterized by the following two parameters: (i) σ the probability of extra zero counts and (ii) λ the expected count of the Poisson component. The mean is given by the expression $(1 - \sigma)\lambda$ and one can consider settings where simultaneous changes in the σ, λ parameters before and after the change point do not lead to changes in the corresponding mean parameter. A least squares criterion, based on fitting different means before and after a candidate for the change point, would not be able to identify such structural changes, while a maximum likelihood based criterion clearly would. The same holds true for other complex models and hence a *comprehensive* study of the problem under the maximum likelihood criterion is warranted.

The key objective of this paper is to investigate the estimation of the common change point in *independent panel data* based both on the least squares and the maximum likelihood criteria for a wide class of statistical models and further compare the assumptions needed to establish consistency of the respective estimates, as well as the nature of their asymptotic distributions. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive treatise in the literature on maximum likelihood based estimation of the change point for panel data in a general setting. The general setting adopted, encompasses as a special case, exponential families. Further, for the least squares criterion for panel data, we also consider a more general setting for temporally dependent data than the one considered in previous literature (e.g. (Bai, 2010)).

Our results show that maximum likelihood estimates require a *stronger identifiability condition* (denoted as SNR2 in Section 3) vis-a-vis that for least squares estimates (denoted as SNR1 in Section 2), while the asymptotic distribution of the change point exhibits smaller variance. The singular case is for normally distributed data, where the identifiability condition needed to establish consistency and obtain the asymptotic distribution is identical for the two criteria.

Another key contribution of the paper is the introduction of a data based *adaptive inference* scheme for obtaining the asymptotic distribution of the change point estimate in practice. As established in the literature of least squares criterion and further shown in this paper for the maximum likelihood criterion, there are three distinct asymptotic regimes for the change point estimator that depend on the norm difference of the model parameters before and after the


change point. Since that norm difference is not *a priori known*, the practitioner faces a dilemma of which regime to employ for the construction of confidence intervals for the change point parameter. Our proposed scheme overcomes this issue and provides a unified regime that *self-adapts* to the true underlying setting, thus enabling the data analyst to construct accurate confidence intervals. To the best of our knowledge, this topic has not been pursued in the literature before.

Problem Formulation: We consider panel data comprising m series (variables), with each series observed at n time points. The observations are denoted by $\{X_{kt}^{(n)} : 1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq t \leq n\}$. In general, the sequence of observations available depends on the number of time points n ; however, for ease of exposition and to reduce notational overhead, we shall write X_{kt} for $X_{kt}^{(n)}$. Further, there is a single structural change common across all panels, that occurs at $\tau_n \in (0, 1)$, referred to as the common break/change point. We assume that $\{X_{kt}\}$ are independent over k . For each k , variables within the sets $\{X_{kt} : t \leq n\tau_n\}$ and $\{X_{kt} : t > n\tau_n\}$ are independently and identically distributed, whereas variables between these two sets are independent¹. Throughout this paper, we assume $0 < c^* < \tau_n < 1 - c^* < 1$ for some $c^* > 0$ and consider estimates of τ_n which are in $(c^*, 1 - c^*)$.

We are interested in obtaining the least squares and the maximum likelihood estimates of τ_n for a wide range of statistical models, under suitable regularity conditions. The least squares estimation problem is presented in Section 2 for independent and identically distributed data, while that of maximum likelihood estimation in Section 3. Further, extensions to time dependent data for least squares estimates are presented in Section 2.3. Finally, the issue of adaptive inference is examined in Section 4.

The following diagram provides a schematic road-map for the main results established, as well as illuminating examples of interest in econometrics. In the diagram the following abbreviations are employed: *indep*: independent, *dep*: dependent, *conv*: Convergence, *asyp distribn*: asymptotic distribution, *Thm*: Theorem, *Prop*: Proposition, *Rem*: Remark, *Pf*: Proof, *Sec*: Section, *Exm*: Example, *WN*: white noise, *adapt inf*: adaptive inference and *Supp*: Supplementary file. By γ we mean $\gamma_{L,LSE}, \gamma_{R,LSE}, \gamma_{L,LSE}^*, \gamma_{R,LSE}^*$ and c_1 .

¹The assumption of independence across time is relaxed in Section 2.3.



2 Least squares estimation of the common break model parameters

We present asymptotic properties of the least squares estimator of the change point τ_n . The underlying assumption is that the break τ_n occurs due to a change in mean parameters of $\{X_{kt}\}$, which is equivalent to the following statement. For each $k \geq 1$,

$$E(X_{kt}) = \mu_{1k}(n)I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mu_{2k}(n)I(t > n\tau_n),$$

where $\mu_{1k}(n) \neq \mu_{2k}(n)$ for at least one k . Note that in general, $\{EX_{kt}\}$ depends on n . For ease of exposition, henceforth we write μ_{ik} for $\mu_{ik}(n)$ for all $k, n \geq 1$.

The least squares estimator $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$ of τ_n can be obtained by optimizing the following criterion function:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} &= \arg \max_{b \in (c^*, 1-c^*)} M_n(b) \text{ where} \\ M_n(b) &= \sum_{k=1}^m M_{k,n}(b), \quad M_{k,n}(b) = -\frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{nb} (X_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k}(b))^2 + \sum_{t=nb+1}^n (X_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{2k}(b))^2 \right], \\ \hat{\mu}_{1k}(b) &= \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} X_{kt} \text{ and } \hat{\mu}_{2k}(b) = \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n X_{kt}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

Rate of convergence for $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$. To establish our results, we consider the following assumptions.

$$(A1) \sup_{k,n,t} E(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))^4 < \infty.$$

Note that (A1) implies $\sup_{k,n,t} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) < \infty$.

Set $\mu_i = (\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2}, \dots, \mu_{im})$, $i = 1, 2$ and consider the following *signal-to-noise* condition.

$$(SNR1) \quad nm^{-1} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Assumption (A1) controls the 4th moment of $\{X_{kt}\}$, which arises to control the variance of the least squares quadratic criterion function posited above. Observe that $n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2$ is the gross signal in the observed data set. Therefore, $nm^{-1}\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2$ indicates average signal per series, which is allowed to grow to ∞ in (SNR1). Given the (A1) and (SNR1) assumptions, the following rate result for $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$ can be established, whose proof is given in Section 5.1.

Theorem 2.1. Least squares convergence rate. Suppose (A1) and (SNR1) hold. Then,

$$n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 (\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} - \tau_n) = O_P(1).$$

Asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$. For the panel data setting, there are three different regimes, as shown in Bai (2010) : (a) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, (b) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and (c) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Asymptotic distributions of the change point estimate are different in these three regimes.

Recall that in the presence of a single panel, the following two results have been established in the literature: (i) if $|\mu_1 - \mu_2| \rightarrow 0$ (Regime (b)) at an appropriate rate as a function of the sample size n , then the asymptotic distribution of the change point is given by the maximizer of a Brownian motion with triangular drift (for details see [Bhattacharya \(1994\)](#)); and (ii) if $|\mu_1 - \mu_2| \rightarrow c$ (Regime (c)), then the asymptotic distribution of the change point, in the random design setting, is given by the maximizer of a two-sided compound Poisson process (for details see Chapter 14 of the book by [Kosorok \(2008\)](#)). As previously mentioned and will be established rigorously next, in the panel data setting analogous regimes emerge, with the modification that in the case of (ii) since we are dealing with a fixed design, the process becomes a two-sided generalized random walk; in addition there exists a third one (Regime (a)), where the asymptotic distribution of the change point becomes degenerate at the true value.

Next, we introduce assumptions needed to establish these results. In Regime (a), the asymptotic distribution of the change point can be derived under the same assumptions as in Theorem 2.1. On the other hand, in the second and third regimes, a non-degenerate limit distribution can be obtained under the following additional assumptions. Detailed comments on these assumptions will be provided after stating the results.

Regime (b): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, **assumptions.** Note that existence of $\text{Var}(X_{kt})$ is guaranteed by (A1). Denote

$$\text{Var}(X_{kt}) = \sigma_{1k}^2(n)I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \sigma_{2k}^2(n)I(t > n\tau_n), \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (2.2)$$

For ease of presentation, we write σ_{ik} for $\sigma_{ik}(n)$. Let,

$$\gamma_{\text{L, LSE}}^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{\text{R, LSE}}^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{2k}^2}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2}. \quad (2.3)$$

We then require,

(A2) $\gamma_{\text{L, LSE}}$ and $\gamma_{\text{R, LSE}}$ exist.

(A3) There exists an $\epsilon > 0$, such that $\inf_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) > \epsilon$.

Regime (c): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, **assumptions.** Consider the following disjoint and exhaustive subsets of $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, m(n)\}$:

$$\mathcal{K}_0 = \{k : 1 \leq k \leq m(n), \lim(\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}) \neq 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}_0^c = \{k : 1 \leq k \leq m(n), \lim(\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}) = 0\}, \forall n \geq 1.$$

Clearly, \mathcal{K}_0 is a finite set. We consider the following assumptions on \mathcal{K}_0 .

(A4) \mathcal{K}_0 does not vary with n .

(A5) For some $\tau^* \in (c^*, 1 - c^*)$, $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, there is a collection of independent random variables $\{X_{ik}^* : k \in \mathcal{K}_0, i = 1, 2\}$ such that for all $0 < f < 1$,

$$X_{k \lfloor nf \rfloor} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} X_{1k}^* I(f \leq \tau^*) + X_{2k}^* I(f > \tau^*). \quad (2.5)$$

Let $E(X_{ik}^*) = \mu_{ik}^*$ (say). For all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$ and $i = 1, 2$, we have $\mu_{ik}(n) \rightarrow \mu_{ik}^*$.

We consider the following assumptions on \mathcal{K}_n . Let

$$c_1^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\gamma_{L, LSE}^{*2} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2, \quad \gamma_{R, LSE}^{*2} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{2k}^2. \quad (2.7)$$

(A6) c_1 , $\gamma_{L, LSE}^*$ and $\gamma_{R, LSE}^*$ exist.

(A7) $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}| \rightarrow 0$.

Let $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$ denote equality in distribution for random variables X and Y . The following theorem provides the limiting distribution of $\hat{\tau}_{n, LSE}$. Its proof is given in Section 5.2.

Theorem 2.2. Least squares asymptotic distributions. Suppose (A1) and (SNR1) hold. Then, the following statements are true.

(a) If $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n, LSE} - \tau_n) = 0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\hat{\tau}_{n, LSE} = \tau_n) = 1.$$

(b) If (A2) and (A3) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, then

$$n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n, LSE} - \tau_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + \gamma_{L, LSE} B_h I(h \leq 0) + \gamma_{R, LSE} B_h I(h > 0)), \quad (2.8)$$

where B_h denotes the standard Brownian motion.

(c) Suppose (A3)-(A7) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, then

$$n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in c^2\mathbb{Z}} (D(h) + C(h) + A(h))$$

where for each $\tilde{h} \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$D(c^2(\tilde{h} + 1)) - D(c^2\tilde{h}) = 0.5\text{Sign}(-h)c_1^2, \quad (2.9)$$

$$C(c^2(\tilde{h} + 1)) - C(c^2\tilde{h}) = (\gamma_{L,LSE}^* I(\tilde{h} \leq 0) + \gamma_{R,LSE}^* I(\tilde{h} > 0))W_{\tilde{h}}, \quad W_{\tilde{h}} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (2.10)$$

$$A(c^2(\tilde{h} + 1)) - A(c^2\tilde{h}) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} \left[(Z_{k\tilde{h}} - \mu_{1k}^*)^2 - (Z_{k\tilde{h}} - \mu_{2k}^*)^2 \right], \quad (2.11)$$

$\{Z_{k\tilde{h}}\}$ are independently distributed with $Z_{k\tilde{h}} \stackrel{d}{=} X_{1k}^* I(\tilde{h} < 0) + X_{2k}^* I(\tilde{h} \geq 0)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$.

Discussion of Theorem 2.2. Next, we provide comments on the assumptions and how they relate to the three regimes established in Theorem 2.2. In the first regime, the signal for $\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE}$ is high and therefore the difference $(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)$ becomes a point mass at 0. On the other hand, in the second and third regimes, the total signal is weak and moderate, respectively, and a non-degenerate limit distribution can be obtained under additional assumptions.

Under the last two regimes, the results are based on the weak convergence of the process

$$M_n^*(h) = \sum_{k=1}^m M_{k,n}^*(h) \text{ where } M_{k,n}^*(h) = n(M_{k,n}(\tau_n + n^{-1}\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 h) - M_{k,n}(\tau_n)), \\ h \in \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \{-(n-1), -(n-2), \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, (n-2), (n-1)\}. \quad (2.12)$$

Under appropriate conditions (as mentioned in Theorem 2.2), the $\arg \max_h M_n^*(h) = n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)$ converges weakly to the unique $\arg \max$ of the limiting process. For more details see Lemma 5.4.

Regime (b): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. In the second regime, the asymptotic variance of $M_n^*(h)$ is proportional to $\gamma_{L,LSE}$ when $h < 0$ and $\gamma_{R,LSE}$ if $h > 0$ and hence the need for assumption (A2). Discussion of specific models and conditions under which (A2) is satisfied are given in Proposition 2.3 and in Examples 2.1-2.3. Finally, (A3) is required for establishing the non-degeneracy of the asymptotic distribution.

Regime (c): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Under the third regime, the limiting process has two components based on the partition of $\{1, 2, \dots, m(n)\}$ into sets \mathcal{K}_0 and $\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}_0^c$, defined in (2.4).

Observe that \mathcal{K}_n is the collection of all such indices whose corresponding variables eventually have the same mean before and after the change point. In the second regime, \mathcal{K}_0 is the empty set. On the other hand, under the third regime, \mathcal{K}_0 may not be empty, but can be at most a finite set. Hence, \mathcal{K}_n is necessarily an infinite set.

These two sets in the partition contribute differently to the limit. Note that

$$M_n^*(h) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} M_{k,n}^*(h) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} M_{k,n}^*(h) =: M_n^I(h) + M_n^{II}(h), \text{ say.} \quad (2.13)$$

Let $\tilde{M}_n^{II}(c^2\tilde{h}) = M_n^{II}(\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2\tilde{h})$ for all $\tilde{h} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M}_n^{II}(c^2(\tilde{h} + 1)) - \tilde{M}_n^{II}(c^2\tilde{h}) &= M_n^{II}(\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\tilde{h} + 1)) - M_n^{II}(\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2\tilde{h}) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} [(X_{kt} - \mu_{1k})^2 - (X_{kt} - \mu_{2k})^2] I(t = n\tau_n + (\tilde{h} + 1)). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Thus, since \mathcal{K}_0 is a finite set, by (A4) and (A5), $M_n^{II}(h)$ converges weakly to the process $A(h)$, described in Theorem 2.2(c).

As mentioned before, in the second regime $\mathcal{K}_n = \{1, 2, \dots, m(n)\}$. Therefore, in the third regime, the set \mathcal{K}_n can be treated in the same way as in the second regime. Thus, $M_n^I(h)$ converges weakly to an appropriately scaled Gaussian process on $c^2\mathbb{Z}$ with a triangular drift, as given by the definitions of $C(h)$ and $D(h)$ in Theorem 2.2(c). Hence, it becomes obvious the need for assumptions (A3) and (A6). Discussion of specific models and conditions under which (A6) is satisfied are given in Proposition 2.4 and subsection Illustrative Examples 2.1-2.3.

(A7) is a technical assumption. Following the proof of Theorem 2.2(c), at some point we seek to establish the asymptotic normality of

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \quad \forall t \geq 1. \quad (2.15)$$

Note that for $t \geq 1$, $\{(\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) : k \in \mathcal{K}_n\}$ is a collection of infinitely many independent and centered random variables. To apply Lyapunov's central limit theorem to (2.15), we require

$$\frac{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}|^3 E|X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})|^3}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 E(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))^2} \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.16)$$

By (A1) and (A3), the left side of (2.16) is dominated by

$$C \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}|^3}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2} \quad (2.17)$$

for some $C > 0$. (A7) is a sufficient condition for (2.17) to converge to 0. We do not need such an assumption for the second regime, since (A7) under the second regime is automatically satisfied.

Based on Theorem 2.2, the following remarks are immediate consequences.

Remark 2.1. *Note that in (2.12), we use the normalization $n^{-1} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}$ for h for the purpose of making a unified statement. In the third regime, we can also use the normalization n^{-1} for h . Using the latter, we have the following restatement of Theorem 2.2(c).*

Suppose (A1), (A3)-(A7) and (SNR1) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, then

$$n(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (D_1(h) + C_1(h) + A_1(h)), \quad (2.18)$$

where $D_1(h) = D(c^2 h)$, $C_1(h) = C(c^2 h)$, $A_1(h) = A(c^2 h)$ for all $h \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Let B_h be the standard Brownian motion. In the following remarks, we use the relation that for any function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}$, $\arg \max_h f(C^2 h) = C^{-2} \arg \max_h f(h)$ and the processes $B_{C^2 h}$ and $C B_h$ have identical distributions.

Remark 2.2. *Suppose $\sup_k |\sigma_{1k} - \sigma_{2k}| \rightarrow 0$. Then,*

$$\gamma_{L,LSE} = \gamma_{R,LSE} = \gamma_{LSE} \quad (\text{say}) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{L,LSE}^* = \gamma_{R,LSE}^* = \gamma_{LSE}^* \quad (\text{say}). \quad (2.19)$$

Further suppose (A1), (A2), (A3) and (SNR1) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} n \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 (\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n) &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + \gamma_{LSE} B_h) \\ &= \gamma_{LSE}^2 \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5\gamma_{LSE}^2 |h| + \gamma_{LSE} B_{\gamma_{LSE}^2 h}) \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \gamma_{LSE}^2 \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5\gamma_{LSE}^2 |h| + \gamma_{LSE}^2 B_h) \\ &= \gamma_{LSE}^2 \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h). \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Moreover, the conclusion of Theorem 2.2(c) holds under (A1), (A3)-(A7) and (SNR1) with

$C(c^2(h+1)) - C(c^2h) = \gamma_{LSE}^* W_h$ where $W_h \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$.

Remark 2.3. Suppose $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, $\sup_k |\sigma_{1k} - \sigma_{2k}| \rightarrow 0$ and \mathcal{K}_0 is the empty set. Then, in Theorem 2.2(c), $A(h) = 0 \forall h \in c^2\mathbb{Z}$, $c_1 = c$ and $\gamma_{L,LSE}^* = \gamma_{R,LSE}^* = \gamma_{LSE}^*$. Further, suppose (A1), (A3)-(A7) and (SNR1) hold. Then

$$\begin{aligned} n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n) &\stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{\rightarrow} \arg \max_{h \in c^2\mathbb{Z}} (-0.5c^2|h| + \gamma_{LSE}^* B_h) \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \arg \max_{h \in c^2\mathbb{Z}} (-0.5c^2|h| + c^{-1}\gamma_{LSE}^* B_{c^2h}) \\ &= c^2 \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (-0.5|h| + c^{-1}\gamma_{LSE}^* B_h) \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \gamma_{LSE}^{*2} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (-0.5|h| + B_h). \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

In other words, $n(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{\rightarrow} c^{-2}\gamma_{LSE}^{*2} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (-0.5|h| + B_h)$.

Remark 2.4. Suppose $c_1^2 = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 = 0$ and (A1) holds. Then, (A6) and (A7) hold and $\gamma_{L,LSE}^* = \gamma_{R,LSE}^* = 0$. Hence, if further (A4), (A5), (SNR1) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| \rightarrow c > 0$, then $n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{\rightarrow} \arg \max_{h \in c^2\mathbb{Z}} A(h)$, where $A(h)$ is given in (2.11).

2.1 Sufficient conditions for (A2) and (A6)

Conditions (A2) and (A6) which guarantee the existence of certain limits are not satisfied without some restrictions on the mean and variance parameters in the panel data model. For example, these limits may fail to exist if the variance parameters $\{\sigma_{ik}(n)\}$ oscillate over n . The examples in Section 1 of the Supplementary file examine concrete scenarios where the limits do not exist.

Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, given below, provide sufficient conditions for (A2) and (A6) to hold. Their proofs are respectively given in Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2.

Proposition 2.3. (A2) holds if (a)-(e) described below, are satisfied for some $\mu_{ik}^* \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma_{ik}^* > 0$, which are free of n .

$$(a) \sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\sigma_{ik}^2(n) - \sigma_{ik}^{*2}| \rightarrow 0 \text{ for all } i = 1, 2.$$

$$(b) \sup_k |\mu_{ik}(n) - \mu_{ik}^*| = O((m(n))^{-1/2} \|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2) \text{ for all } i = 1, 2.$$

$$(c) \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)| = o(\sqrt{m(n)} \|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2).$$

$$(d) \frac{\|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|}{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|} \rightarrow 1.$$

$$(e) \frac{m(n+1)}{m(n)} \rightarrow 1.$$

Suppose $\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = \sigma_i^2(n) \forall k, n \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$. Then (A2) holds if $\sigma_i^2(n) \rightarrow \sigma_i^2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, if $\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = \sigma_i^2$ for all $k, n \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$, then (A2) is always satisfied.

Proposition 2.4. (A6) holds if (a), (e) described in Proposition 2.3 and (f), (g) described below, are satisfied for some $\mu_{ik}^* \in \mathbb{R}$, which are free of n .

(f) $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{ik}(n) - \mu_{ik}^*| = O(m(n)^{-1/2})$ for all $i = 1, 2$.

(g) $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)| = o(\sqrt{m(n)})$.

Conditions (a), (c) in Proposition 2.3 and, Conditions (a), (g) in Proposition 2.4 seem to be necessary for (A2) and (A6) to hold. It is justified by the examples given in Section 1 of the Supplementary file.

The following remark is immediate by the mean value theorem.

Remark 2.5. Condition (a) is implied by (b) or (f) in the above propositions in the presence of a smooth mean-variance relationship, say, if for all $k, n \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$, $\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = g(\mu_{ik}(n))$, where $g(\cdot)$ is a continuous function with bounded first derivative.

2.2 Illustrative Examples

We discuss selective examples, which are widely encountered in practice. Suppose (SNR1) holds for all the following examples. Conditions (b)-(e) and (e)-(g) in Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 are respectively assumed for Regimes (b) and (c) (after replacing $\{\mu_{ik} : k \geq 1, i = 1, 2\}$ by the analogous mean parameters). Further, (f) in Proposition 2.4 implies (A7). For all the examples below, we also assume (A4) for regime (b).

Example 2.1. Bernoulli data. A random variable X follows a $\text{Ber}(p)$ distribution if $P(X = 1) = 1 - P(X = 0) = p$. Suppose $\{X_{kt}\}$ are independently distributed and for all $k \geq 1$,

$$X_{kt} \sim \text{Ber}(p_{1k}(n))I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \text{Ber}(p_{2k}(n))I(t > n\tau_n) \quad (2.22)$$

and $p_{1k}(n) \neq p_{2k}(n)$ for at least one k . Then, (A1) is satisfied and the conclusions of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2(a) hold for the model in (2.22).

Now, (A3) is satisfied if for some $0 < C < 1$, we have

$$0 < C < p_{ik}(n) < 1 - C < 1 \quad \forall k, n \geq 1 \text{ and } i = 1, 2. \quad (2.23)$$

Also, (A5) holds if for some constants $\{p_{ik}^* : k \in \mathcal{K}_0, i = 1, 2\}$ and as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\tau_n \rightarrow \tau^* \text{ and } p_{ik}(n) \rightarrow p_{ik}^*, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}_0 \text{ and } i = 1, 2. \quad (2.24)$$

Conditions (b)-(e) and (e)-(g) in Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, respectively, imply (A2) and (A6). By Remark 2.5, Condition (a) is satisfied by Conditions (b) or (f) as in this example, $\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = p_{ik}(n)(1 - p_{ik}(n)) = g(p_{ik}(n)) = g(\mu_{ik}(n))$ where $g(x) = x(1 - x)$ is continuous with bounded first derivative for all $0 < x < 1$.

Therefore, under (2.23), the conclusion of Theorem 2.2(b) holds for the model in (2.22). Moreover, the conclusion of Theorem 2.2(c) holds for (2.22) if we further assume (2.24).

Example 2.2. Poisson data. A discrete random variable X is $\text{Poi}(\lambda)$ distributed, if for all $x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we have $P(X = x) = \frac{1}{x!} e^{-\lambda} \lambda^x$. Suppose $\{X_{kt}\}$ are independently distributed and for all $k \geq 1$,

$$X_{kt} \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda_{1k}(n))I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \text{Poi}(\lambda_{2k}(n))I(t > n\tau_n) \quad (2.25)$$

and $\lambda_{1k}(n) \neq \lambda_{2k}(n)$ for at least one k . Suppose for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$,

$$C_1 < \inf_{i,k,n} \lambda_{ik}(n) \leq \sup_{i,k,n} \lambda_{ik}(n) < C_2. \quad (2.26)$$

The last inequality in (2.26) implies (A1). Therefore, the conclusions of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2(a) hold for the model in (2.25).

(A3) is satisfied if the first inequality in (2.26) holds. Conditions (b)-(e) and (e)-(g) in Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 respectively imply (A2) and (A6). Also, (A5) holds if (2.24) is satisfied after replacing p by λ .

Hence, under (2.26), the conclusion of Theorem 2.2(b) holds for the model in (2.25). Also the conclusion of Theorem 2.2(c) holds for (2.25) if we further assume (2.24) with p replaced by λ .

Example 2.3. Normal data. X follows a $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, if its probability density function is

$$f_X(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^2} \quad \forall x, \mu \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \sigma > 0. \quad (2.27)$$

Suppose $\{X_{kt}\}$ are independently distributed and for all $k \geq 1$,

$$X_{kt} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{1k}(n), \sigma_{1k}^2(n))I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mathcal{N}(\mu_{2k}(n), \sigma_{2k}^2(n))I(t > n\tau_n), \quad (2.28)$$

$\mu_{1k}(n) \neq \mu_{2k}(n)$ for at least one k and for some $C > 0$, $\sup_{k,n} \sigma_{ik}^2(n) < C$, $\forall i = 1, 2$.

Then, (A1) is satisfied and the conclusions of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2(a) hold for (2.28).

Next, suppose Condition (a) in Proposition 2.3 is satisfied. Then, by Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, (A2) and (A6) hold. Also suppose (A3) holds.

Under the above assumptions, the conclusion of Theorem 2.2(b) holds for the model in (2.28). Moreover, Conditions (a)-(e) can be relaxed if $\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = \sigma_i^2(n)$ and $\sigma_i^2(n) \rightarrow \sigma_i^2$ or $\sigma_i^2(n) = \sigma_i^2$ for all $k, n \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$.

Additionally, assume that (2.24) holds after replacing p by μ and σ . Then, (A5) is satisfied and the conclusion of Theorem 2.2(c) holds for the model in (2.28).

2.3 Extensions to Time Dependent Data

Next, we introduce dependence over the index t . We consider stationary time series models, since they are widely encountered in applications. There are different notions of stationarity established in the literature, including weak, strict, r -th order ($r > 2$) and moment stationarity. In this section, we employ the latter two types of stationarity, defined below.

Definition: A process $\{Y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is called *centered 4-order stationary* if the following statement holds.

(S1) For all $t, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r \geq 1$ and $r = 1, 2, 3, 4$,

$$E(Y_t) = 0, \quad E|Y_t|^r < \infty$$

and $\text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2}, \dots, X_{kt_r})$ depends only on the lags $t_2 - t_1, t_3 - t_1, \dots, t_r - t_1$.

A process $\{Y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is called *centered moment stationary* if (S1) holds for all $r \geq 1$.

To introduce dependence, we assume that for all k , $\{X_{kt}\}$ is driven by a stationary process.

(D1) For each k and t ,

$$X_{kt} = \mu_{1k}I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mu_{2k}I(t > n\tau_n) + Y_{kt} \quad (2.29)$$

where for each k , $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a centered 4-order stationary process and not observable. Also $\{Y_{kt}\}$ are independent over k . In general, $\{\mu_{ik} : k \geq 1, i = 1, 2\}$ may depend on the sample size n , whereas in this section, $\{Y_{kt}\}$ do not depend on n .

We also assume that the cumulants are summable.

$$(D2) \quad \sum_{\substack{t_i \in \mathbb{Z} \\ 1 \leq i \leq r}} \sup_k |\text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t_1+1)}, X_{k(t_2+1)}, \dots, X_{k(t_r+1)})| < \infty, \quad \forall r = 1, 2, 3.$$

Note that if $\{Y_{kt}\}$ are all independent, then (D2) implies (A1). Note that (D1) and (D2) are the minimal assumptions required to establish our results. Later in Remarks 2.6-2.8 and in Example 2.4, we shall establish that these assumptions are satisfied by a large class of stationary processes.

Given assumptions (D1), (D2) and (SNR1), we can then establish the following result. Its proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 and is given in the supplement.

Theorem 2.5. *Least squares convergence rate for dependent data.* Suppose (D1), (D2) and (SNR1) hold. Then,

$$n \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 (\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n) = O_P(1). \quad (2.30)$$

Next, we establish the analogue of Theorem 2.2 for the time dependent setting.

In Regime (a): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, the conclusion of Theorem 2.2(a) continues to hold under (D1), (D2) and (SNR1). Additional assumptions are required to obtain non-degenerate asymptotic distributions under the other two regimes.

Due to dependence amongst observations, we need the following stronger assumption.

(D3) For each $k \geq 1$, $\{Y_{kt}\}$ is a centered moment stationary process and

$$\sum_{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r = -\infty}^{\infty} \sup_k |\text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t_1+1)}, X_{k(t_2+1)}, \dots, X_{k(t_r+1)})| < \infty, \quad \forall r \geq 1.$$

Later in Remarks 2.6-2.8 and in Example 2.4, we shall see (D3) being satisfied by many stationary processes. For a linear process with i.i.d. innovations, this assumption can be relaxed using an appropriate truncation on the innovation process; see Example 2.5.

Regime (b): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, assumptions. Recall $\gamma_{L,LSE}$ and $\gamma_{R,LSE}$ from (2.3). By (D1), $\sigma_{1k}^2 = \text{Var}(X_{k1}) = \text{Var}(Y_{k1}) = \text{Var}(Y_{kn(\tau_n+1)}) = \text{Var}(X_{kn(\tau_n+1)}) = \sigma_{2k}^2$ and hence $\gamma_{L,LSE} =$

$\gamma_{R,LSE} = \gamma_{LSE}$, as defined in (2.19). But as γ_{LSE} uses only the marginal distributions of $\{X_{kt}\}$, it cannot provide us the asymptotic variance of $n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)$ when $\{X_{kt}\}$ are dependent over t . Next, we introduce the counterpart of γ_{LSE} which exploits dependency among $\{X_{kt}\}$.

For all $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\gamma_{(h_1, h_2), DEP, LSE}$ equal

$$\lim_{\substack{0 \vee [h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}] \\ t_1 = 0 \wedge [h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}]} \sum_{0 \vee [h_2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}] \\ t_2 = 0 \wedge [h_2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}]} \left(\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2}) \right). \quad (2.31)$$

(D4) For all $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma_{(h_1, h_2), DEP, LSE}$ exists and $\gamma_{(h_1, h_1), DEP, LSE} > 0$.

We assume (D4) to obtain the asymptotic distribution of $n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)$ when $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. If $\{Y_{kt}\}$ are all independent/uncorrelated, then $\gamma_{(h_1, h_2), DEP, LSE} = \min(|h_1|, |h_2|)\gamma_{LSE}^2$ and (D4) is equivalent to (A2) and (A3). Also it is easy to see that if (a)-(e) in Proposition 2.3 are satisfied with

$$\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \sum_{\substack{0 \vee [h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}] \\ t_1 = 0 \wedge [h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}]} \sum_{\substack{0 \vee [h_2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}] \\ t_2 = 0 \wedge [h_2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}]} \text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2}) \quad \forall k, n, i,$$

and for some $C > 0$

$$\inf_k \sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(h+1)}) > C, \quad (2.32)$$

then (D4) holds.

Regime (c): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, **assumptions.** Recall the partition of $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, m(n)\}$ into \mathcal{K}_0 and $\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}_0^c$, described in (2.4). We assume (A4) and the following assumption on \mathcal{K}_0 .

(D5) There exist $\tau^* \in (c^*, 1 - c^*)$ and $\mu_{ik}^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau^*$ and $\mu_{ik}(n) \rightarrow \mu_{ik}^*$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$ and $i = 1, 2$.

Unlike (A5), here we do not require weak convergence of $\{Y_{kt}\}$, since due to (D1) they do not depend on n . If $\{Y_{kt}\}$ are independent, then (D5) is equivalent to (A5).

Next, we consider assumptions on \mathcal{K}_n . Recall $\gamma_{L,LSE}^*$ and $\gamma_{R,LSE}^*$ from (2.7). Like Regime (b), here also $\gamma_{L,LSE}^* = \gamma_{R,LSE}^* = \gamma_{LSE}^*$, as defined in (2.19) and we need to introduce the counterpart of γ_{LSE}^* which exploits dependency among $\{X_{kt}\}$.

For all $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$\gamma_{(t_1, t_2), \text{DEP, LSE}}^* = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2}). \quad (2.33)$$

Recall $c_1^2 = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n^c} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2$. We assume (A7) and the following assumption.

(D6) c_1 exists. For all $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\gamma_{(t_1, t_2), \text{DEP, LSE}}^*$ exists and $\gamma_{(t_1, t_1), \text{DEP, LSE}}^* > 0$.

If $\{Y_{kt}\}$ are all independent/uncorrelated, then $\gamma_{(t_1, t_2), \text{DEP, LSE}}^* = \gamma_{\text{LSE}}^{*2} I(t_1 = t_2)$ and (D6) is equivalent to (A3) and (A6). Moreover, it is easy to see that if (e)-(g) in Proposition 2.4 are satisfied and $\inf_k \text{Var}(X_{kt}) > C > 0$, then (D6) holds.

The following Theorem establishes the asymptotic distribution of $n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}} - \tau_n)$ under appropriate dependence on $\{X_{kt}\}$. Its proof is given in Section 5.3.

Theorem 2.6. Asymptotic distributions under temporal dependence. Suppose (D1), (D2), (SNR1) hold. Then the following statements hold.

(a) If $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}} = \tau_n) = 1.$$

(b) Further, if (D3) and (D4) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, then

$$n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}} - \tau_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h^*). \quad (2.34)$$

where for all $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r \geq 1$,

$$(B_{h_1}^*, B_{h_2}^*, \dots, B_{h_r}^*) \sim \mathcal{N}_r(0, \Sigma) \quad \text{where} \quad \Sigma = ((\gamma_{(h_1, h_2), \text{DEP, MSE}}))_{1 \leq h_1, h_2 \leq r}. \quad (2.35)$$

(c) Suppose (A4), (A7), (D3), (D5) and (D6) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, then

$$n(\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}} - \tau_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (D^*(h) + C^*(h) + A^*(h)) \quad (2.36)$$

where for each $h, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} D^*(h) &= -0.5c_1^2|h|, \quad C^*(h) = \sum_{t=0 \wedge h}^{0 \vee h} W_t^*, \\ (W_{t_1}^*, W_{t_2}^*, \dots, W_{t_r}^*) &\sim \mathcal{N}_r(0, \Sigma^*), \quad \Sigma^* = ((\gamma_{(t_1, t_2), \text{DEP, LSE}}^*))_{1 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq r}, \end{aligned}$$

$$A^*(h) = \sum_{t=0 \vee h}^{0 \vee h} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} \left[(Y_{kt} + (\mu_{2k}^* - \mu_{1k}^*) \text{sign}(h))^2 - Y_{kt}^2 \right] \text{sign}(h).$$

The following remarks and examples are direct consequences of Theorem 2.6.

Remark 2.6. A process $\{Y_t\}$ is called *white noise*, if $\text{Cum}(Y_t, Y_{t'}) = 0 \ \forall t \neq t'$. Suppose $\{X_{kt}\}$ satisfy all the assumptions in Theorem 2.6 and for each $k \geq 1$, $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a white noise process. Then, in Theorem 2.6, we can replace (D4) and (D6) by (A2), (A3) and (A3), (A6), respectively. Moreover, in this case, the asymptotic distributions in Theorem 2.6 are identical to those posited in Theorem 2.2.

Remark 2.7. A process $\{Y_t\}$ is called *m-dependent*, if for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq r$, $r \geq 2$ and $|t_i - t_j| > m$, $\{Y_{t_i} : 1 \leq i \leq r\}$ are independently distributed. Suppose (D1) and (SNR1) hold and for each $k \geq 1$, $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is an *m-dependent* process. Then, the infinite sum in (D2) reduces to a finite sum. Hence (D2) and consequently the conclusion of Theorem 2.6(a) hold if $\sup_k E|Y_{kt}|^4 < \infty$. Further, suppose $\sup_k E|Y_{kt}|^r < \infty \ \forall r \geq 1$. Then, (D3) is satisfied and the conclusions of Theorem 2.6(b) and (c) hold, respectively under (D4) and, (A4), (A7), (D5) and (D6).

Remark 2.8. Suppose (D1) and (SNR1) hold and for each $k \geq 1$, $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is an *m-dependent white noise* process. Then, by Remarks 2.6 and 2.7, the conclusion of Theorem 2.6(a) holds if $\sup_k E|Y_{kt}|^4 < \infty$. Next, suppose $\sup_k E|Y_{kt}|^r < \infty \ \forall r \geq 1$. Then, the conclusion of Theorem 2.6(b) holds under (A2) and (A3). Also the conclusion of Theorem 2.6(c) holds when (A3)-(A7) are satisfied. In this case, the asymptotic distributions in Theorem 2.6 are identical to those posited in Theorem 2.2.

Specific examples of *m-dependent white noise* error processes are given in Section 2 of the Supplementary file. Next, we discuss an example which is neither an *m-dependent*, nor a white noise process.

Example 2.4. Gaussian process. A process $\{Y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is called a centered stationary Gaussian process with covariance kernel $g(\cdot)$, if $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a symmetric function with unique global maximum at 0, $g(0) > 0$ and for all $t, t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $E(Y_t) = 0$ and $\text{Cum}(X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}) = g(t_1 - t_2) = g(|t_1 - t_2|)$. Suppose for all $k, t \geq 1$,

$$X_{kt} = \mu_{1k}I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mu_{2k}I(t > n\tau_n) + Y_{kt} \quad (2.37)$$

where $\mu_{1k} \neq \mu_{2k}$ for at least one k , $\{Y_{kt}\}$ are independent over k and for each k , $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a centered stationary Gaussian process with covariance kernel $g_k(\cdot)$ satisfying

$$\sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} \sup_k |g_k(|h|)| < \infty. \quad (2.38)$$

Then, (D1) and (D2) are satisfied. Further, under (SNR1) the conclusions of Theorems 2.5 and 2.6(a) hold for (2.37).

As all cumulants of $\{X_{kt}\}$ of order more than 2 are zero, (D2) and (D3) are equivalent.

The conclusion of Theorem 2.6(b) holds for (2.37) under (SNR1) and (D4). (D4) holds if for some $C > 0$, $\inf_k \sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} g_k(h) > C$ and (a)-(e) in Proposition 2.3 are satisfied with

$$\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \sum_{\substack{t_i=0 \wedge [h_i \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}] \\ i=1,2}}^{0 \vee [h_i \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}]} g_k(|t_1 - t_2|) \quad \forall k, n, i. \quad (2.39)$$

The conclusion of 2.6(c) holds for (2.37) under (SNR1), (A4), (A7), (D5) and (D6). (D6) holds if (e)-(g) in Proposition 2.4 are satisfied and for some $C > 0$, $\inf_k g_k(0) > C$.

$\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ in (D1) may not always be an m -dependent or a Gaussian process. This implies that (D3) may not always be satisfied, even if $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a moment stationary process. In Section 2 of the Supplementary file, we discuss a wide class of α -mixing processes for which (D3) holds.

The next example relaxes Assumption (D3) and considers a weaker condition when $\{Y_{kt}\}$ is a linear process, as was considered in Bai (2010). Its proof is based on an appropriate truncation on the innovation process and is given in Section 5.4.

Example 2.5. Linear Error Process. Suppose $\{\varepsilon_{k,t}\}$ are independent and identically distributed over t and independent over k with mean 0, variance $\sigma_{k\varepsilon}^2$ and $\sup_k E\varepsilon_{k,t}^4 < \infty$. Suppose for each $k, t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{kt} &= \mu_{1k}I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mu_{2k}I(t > n\tau_n) + Y_{kt} \quad \text{where} \\ Y_{kt} &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{k,j}\varepsilon_{k,t-j} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_k \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |a_{k,j}| < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (2.40)$$

Then, (D1) and (D2) are satisfied and the following statements hold.

(a) If (SNR1) holds and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} = \tau_n) = 1$.

(b) Further suppose (D4) holds for $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and (A4), (A7), (D5) and (D6) hold for $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Then the conclusions of Theorem 2.6(b) and (c) hold with

$$\text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2}) = \sigma_{k\varepsilon}^2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{k,j} a_{k,j+|t_2-t_1|} \right) \quad \forall t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } k \geq 1.$$

(D3) holds if and only if all moments of $\{\varepsilon_{k,t}\}$ are finite. But as stated above, the asymptotic distributions in Theorem 2.6 still hold for the model (2.40), when $E|\varepsilon_{k,t}|^r = \infty$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $r \geq 5$.

2.3.1 Connections to the results presented in Bai (2010)

(A) Next, we compare the results previously established with those in the paper by Bai (2010) that posited that data $\{X_{kt}\}$ are generated according to model (2.40) and considered the following assumptions.

1. $\sup_k \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j |a_{k,j}| < \infty$
2. $m^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \rightarrow \infty$
3. $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ and $n^{-1} m \log(\log(n)) \rightarrow 0$

The key result established in that paper is that assuming (1)-(3) we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} = \tau_n) = 1.$$

Details are presented in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in Bai (2010).

In comparison, we assume in Example 2.5 that $\sup_k \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |a_{k,j}| < \infty$ which is clearly weaker than (1). Further, observe that assumptions (SNR1) and (2) above indicate two different regimes, since none of them implies the other one. Moreover, note that assumption (3) above is *stronger* than the posited (SNR1). Therefore, Example 2.5(a) implies Bai (2010)'s result under assumptions (1) and (3).

(B) Recall the quantity γ_{LSE}^* from Remark 2.3 and let B_h denote the standard Brownian motion. Suppose $\{Y_{kt}\}$ in (2.40) are uncorrelated, $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, $n^{-1} m \log(\log(n)) \rightarrow 0$, and

assumptions (A3) and (A6) hold. Then, Bai (2010) also established in Theorem 4.2 that

$$n(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} - \tau) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} c^{-2} \gamma_{\text{LSE}}^{*2} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (-0.5|h| + B_h). \quad (2.41)$$

To derive (2.41), one needs to establish the asymptotic normality of $\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}) Y_{kt}$, presented at the end of the first column on page 90 in Bai (2010). For doing so, assumptions need to be imposed on μ_1 and μ_2 in addition to $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, as we have already discussed in the current study around (2.15)-(2.17). However, such assumptions are missing in the presentation of Bai (2010).

Finally, consider all the assumptions stated in the last paragraph. Further, assume the weaker condition $mn^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ instead of $n^{-1}m \log(\log(n)) \rightarrow 0$. Recall the sets \mathcal{K}_0 and \mathcal{K}_n from (2.4). By Remarks 2.3, 2.6 and Example 2.5(b), we additionally need (A7) and \mathcal{K}_0 as the empty set for (2.41) to hold. Example 2.5(b) provides a more general result for the model (2.40) i.e. when $\{Y_{kt}\}$ are not necessarily uncorrelated.

3 Maximum likelihood estimation of the common break model parameters

In this section, we discuss maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) for the change point τ_n . As will become clear below, stronger assumptions will be needed to establish both the rate and derive the asymptotic distribution of the MLE due to the possible lack of adequate smoothness of the likelihood function.

The problem formulation is as follows: let $\{\mathbb{P}_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d\}$ (d being a finite positive integer) be a family of probability density/mass functions satisfying assumptions (B1)-(B11) described next.

Since d is finite, we define a sequence of d -dimensional vectors or $d \times d$ matrices to be convergent if they converge entry wise. Binary operators such as $\leq, <, \geq$ and $>$ between two d -dimensional vectors or $d \times d$ matrices are also applicable in an entry wise manner. Modulus, power, exponential, log, expectation and variance functions also operate component wise. Let J_d and 1_d be respectively the $d \times d$ matrix and $d \times 1$ vector whose entries are all equal to 1. Finally, we consider $\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X)$ to be a column vector.

Next, we postulate assumptions needed to establish the results.

(B1) Probability distributions in $\{\mathbb{P}_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ are distinct for different λ ; i.e., $\mathbb{P}_{\lambda_1} = \mathbb{P}_{\lambda_2}$, if and only if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$.

(B2) The support of \mathbb{P}_λ does not depend on λ .

(B3) The parameter space Λ contains an open set of which the true parameter value is an interior point.

Suppose that for almost all X , $\mathbb{P}_\lambda(X)$ is differentiable with respect to $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Further, suppose that X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are i.i.d. from \mathbb{P}_{λ_0} for an unknown $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$. Then, the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of λ_0 is a root of the likelihood equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X_i) = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Note that the above set of assumptions is sufficient to establish that there is a (measurable) root $\hat{\lambda}_n$ of the likelihood equation (3.1) so that $\hat{\lambda}_n \xrightarrow{P} \lambda_0$. It is easy to see that if there is a unique solution of (3.1) for almost all $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ and for all sufficiently large n (which may depend upon the sequence in consideration) and if Λ is an open set, then this solution will be the MLE and also consistent for λ_0 . If there is more than one root of (3.1) which maximizes the joint log-likelihood $\sum_{i=1}^n \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X_i)$, then we select the consistent solution. For more details see [Lehmann and Casella \(1998\)](#).

To obtain asymptotic results for $\hat{\lambda}_n$, assumptions are needed to control the second derivative of the joint log-likelihood with respect to λ , given next.

(B4) $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log P_\lambda(X)$ exists for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and almost everywhere in $X \sim P_a$, $a \in \Lambda$.

(B5) For some $0 < C_1 \leq C_2 < \infty$ and measurable function $G_2(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$,

$$0 < C_1 G_2(x) \leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(x) \right| \leq C_2 G_2(x) < \infty \quad \forall x. \quad (3.2)$$

For some $0 < \epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2 < \infty$ and $X \sim \mathbb{P}_\lambda$,

$$0 < \epsilon_1 J_d \leq \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} EG_2(X) \leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (EG_2^4(X))^{1/4} \leq \epsilon_2 J_d < \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

Analogously to the discussion preceding assumption (A1) in Section 2, we require control

over the variance of an estimator to establish its probability convergence. For that we need $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} EG_2^4(X) < \infty$ in (B5) and additionally the following assumption.

$$\textbf{(B6)} \text{ For } X \sim P_\lambda, \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} E \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log P_\lambda(X) \right)' \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log P_\lambda(X) \right) \right]^4 < \infty.$$

If $G_2(x) = C \forall x$, then (B6) (in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2) can be relaxed to the weaker assumption given below.

$$\textbf{(B7)} \text{ For } X \sim P_\lambda, \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} E \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log P_\lambda(X) \right)' \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log P_\lambda(X) \right) \right]^2 < \infty.$$

The condition $G_2(x) = C \forall x$ holds for a wide class of probability distributions, such as the one parameter natural exponential family, which is examined in detail in Example 6.5 below.

Recall the posited setting based on data $\{X_{kt} : 1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq t \leq n\}$ and where for each $k \geq 1$, there is a common break τ_n , so that

$$X_{kt} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k(n)} I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k(n)} I(t > n\tau_n), \quad \theta_k(n), \eta_k(n) \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (3.4)$$

and $\theta_k(n) \neq \eta_k(n)$ for at least some k . For ease of presentation, we shall use θ_k and η_k respectively for $\theta_k(n)$ and $\eta_k(n)$.

The maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$ is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} &= \arg \max_{b \in (c^*, 1-c^*)} \sum_{k=1}^m L_{k,n}(b) \quad \text{where} \\ L_{k,n}(b) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_k(b)}(X_{kt}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\eta}_k(b)}(X_{kt}), \\ \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_k(b)} &= \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\eta}_k(b)}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\eta=\hat{\eta}_k(b)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Existence of $\{\hat{\theta}_k(b), \hat{\eta}_k(b)\}$ is guaranteed by Assumptions (B1)-(B3).

Rate of convergence for $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$. To establish the result, we typically need to deal with the second derivative of the joint log-likelihood at the random points $\hat{\theta}_k(b)$ and $\hat{\eta}_k(b)$ or intermediate points. This can be handled if $\hat{\theta}_k(b), \hat{\eta}_k(b) \in \Lambda$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$. The assumptions (B8) and (B9), below, ensure this. As we deal simultaneously with all $k \leq m$, we also require an appropriate growth rate for $m = m(n)$. When $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, we assume $\log m(n) = o(n)$. For the other two regimes i.e. when $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ or $c > 0$, (SNR2) (stated below) implies

$m = o(\sqrt{n})$, a substantially slower rate of growth than $\log m(n) = o(n)$.

A centered d -dimensional random vector X is called marginally sub-Gaussian, if for all $\epsilon > 0$ and some $C_1, C_2 > 0$, $P(|X| \geq \epsilon 1_d) \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 \epsilon^2} 1_d$, or equivalently if there exists $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $E(e^{tX}) \leq e^{0.5t^2 b^2} 1_d$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This definition of sub-Gaussian also holds for a $d \times d$ random matrix X , if we replace 1_d by J_d .

(B8) For all $X \sim \mathbb{P}_\lambda$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X)$ is a marginally sub-Gaussian random variable.

(B9) For all $X \sim \mathbb{P}_\lambda$, $G_2(X) - E(G_2(X))$ is a marginally sub-Gaussian random variable.

Let $\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=1}^m \|\theta_k - \eta_k\|_2^2$. In this section, we consider the following signal-to-noise condition.

(SNR2) $\sqrt{nm}^{-1} \|\theta - \eta\|_2^2 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Given these assumptions the following rate result for $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$ can be established, whose proof is given in Section 5.5.

Theorem 3.1. MLE convergence rate. *Suppose (B1)-(B6), (B8), (B9), (SNR2) hold and $\log m(n) = o(n)$. Then,*

$$n \|\theta - \eta\|_2^2 (\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n) = O_P(1). \quad (3.6)$$

Remark 3.1. *Suppose that $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(x) = -\Sigma$ for all λ, x and that for some positive definite matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, which does not depend on λ and x . This is equivalent to positing that for each $k \geq 1$, $X_{kt} \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\theta_k, \Gamma)I(t \leq \tau_n) + \mathcal{N}_d(\eta_k, \Gamma)I(t > \tau_n)$, $\theta_k \neq \eta_k$ for at least one k and for some known $d \times d$ positive definite matrix Γ . Then, the result in (3.6) continues to hold under the weaker assumption (B7) (or equivalently (A1) in Section 2) and (SNR1). Therefore, for the Gaussian likelihood, the rate of convergence of the maximum likelihood change point estimate can be established under weaker assumptions.*

Asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$. Next, we present results regarding the asymptotic distribution of $n \|\theta - \eta\|_2^2 (\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n)$. Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1, $(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n)$ is degenerate at 0 if $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$. Analogously to the results in Section 2, additional assumptions are needed to obtain the asymptotic distribution for the cases $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ or $c > 0$, given next.

For $X \sim \mathbb{P}_\lambda$, define

$$I(\lambda) = E \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X) \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X) \right)' \right] \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda, \quad (3.7)$$

which exists by (B6) or (B7). Moreover, by (B4) and (B5), for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$

$$I(\lambda) = -E \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X) \right) \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda, \quad 0 < C_1 J_d \leq \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I(\lambda) \leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} I(\lambda) \leq C_2 J_d < \infty. \quad (3.8)$$

Recall the sets \mathcal{K}_0 and $\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}_0^c$ in (2.4). Let,

$$\gamma_{\text{MLE}}^2 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)' I(\theta_k) (\theta_k - \eta_k)}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{\text{MLE}}^{*2} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\theta_k - \eta_k)' I(\theta_k) (\theta_k - \eta_k).$$

Note that (3.8) implies $\gamma_{\text{MLE}} > 0$. Moreover, $\gamma_{\text{MLE}}^* > 0$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \|\theta_k - \eta_k\|_2^2 > 0$. Existence of γ_{MLE} and γ_{MLE}^* are required respectively for $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and $c > 0$. However, this is guaranteed by the conditions in Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 when μ_{1k} , μ_{2k} , σ_{1k}^2 and σ_{2k}^2 are respectively replaced by θ_k , η_k , $I(\theta_k)$ and $I(\eta_k)$. As \mathcal{K}_0 may not be the empty set under $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, we consider (A4) and (B10), given below, on \mathcal{K}_0 .

- (B10)** (i) There is $\tau^* \in (c^*, 1 - c^*)$ such that $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau^*$.
(ii) $\mathbb{P}_\lambda(x)$ is continuous in both λ and x .
(iii) Let $\{X_{ik}^* : k \in \mathcal{K}_0, i = 1, 2\}$ be a collection of independent random variables such that for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$ and $0 < f < 1$, $X_{k[nf]} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} X_{1k}^* I(f \leq \tau^*) + X_{2k}^* I(f > \tau^*)$.
(iv) Let $X_{1k} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k^*}$ and $X_{2k} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k^*}$. Then for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$, $\theta_k(n) \rightarrow \theta_k^*$ and $\eta_k(n) \rightarrow \eta_k^*$.

The next assumption is on the third derivative of the log-likelihood that takes values in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d \times d}$. Note that the operations of modulus, sup, \leq and expectation on $d \times d \times d$ cubes are component wise.

(B11) $\frac{\partial^3}{\partial \lambda^3} \log P_\lambda(X)$ exists for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and almost everywhere in $X \sim P_a$, $a \in \Lambda$. Moreover, for some measurable function $G_3(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d \times d}$

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{\partial^3}{\partial \lambda^3} \log P_\lambda(x) \right| \leq G_3(x) \quad \forall x \quad (3.9)$$

such that $E(G_3(X)) < \infty$ for any $X \sim P_a$, $a \in \Lambda$.

We are now ready to establish the asymptotic distribution of $n\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n)$. The

proof of the following theorem is given in Section 5.6.

Theorem 3.2. MLE asymptotic distributions. Suppose (B1)-(B6), (B8), (B9) and (SNR2) hold. We then have

(a) If $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ and $\log m(n) = o(n)$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE} = \tau_n) = 1$

(b) If γ_{MLE} exists, (B11) holds and $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, then

$$n\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE} - \tau) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5\gamma_{MLE}^2|h| + \gamma_{MLE}B_h) = \gamma_{MLE}^{-2} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h) \quad (3.10)$$

where B_h corresponds to a standard Brownian motion.

(c) If γ_{MLE}^* exists, (A4), (B10) and (B11) hold, $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\theta_k - \eta_k|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, then

$$n(\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE} - \tau) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (D_2(h) + C_2(h) + A_2(h)),$$

where for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$D_2(h+1) - D_2(h) = -0.5 \text{Sign}(h) \gamma_{MLE}^{*2}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$C_2(h+1) - C_2(h) = \gamma_{MLE}^* W_h, \quad W_h \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (3.12)$$

$$A_2(h+1) - A_2(h) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} \left(\log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k^*}(Z_{kh}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k^*}(Z_{kh}) \right) \quad (3.13)$$

and $\{Z_{kh}\}$ are independently distributed with $Z_{kh} \stackrel{d}{=} X_{1k}^* I(h \leq 0) + X_{2k}^* I(h > 0)$.

Remark 3.2. For the Gaussian case (see remark 3.1), the results in Theorem 3.2 continue to hold under the weaker assumption (B7) (or equivalently (A1) in Section 2) and (SNR1).

Remark 3.3. Suppose $d = 1$. Therefore $\theta_k, \eta_k \in \mathbb{R} \forall k$. Also suppose, for all $k \geq 1$, $E(X_{kt}) = \theta_k I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \eta_k I(t > n\tau_n)$. Let B_h be the standard Brownian motion and denote $V = \text{Var}(\arg \max_h (-0.5|h| + B_h))$. Then under the assumptions in Theorem 3.2(b), if $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, the asymptotic variance V_{MLE} of $n\|\theta - \eta\|_2(\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE} - \tau_n)$ is

$$V_{MLE} = \left(\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 I(\theta_k)} \right)^2 V = \left(\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 I(\eta_k)} \right)^2 V.$$

Recall that $\text{Var}(X_{kt}) = \sigma_{1k}^2 I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \sigma_{2k}^2 I(t > n\tau_n)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Suppose $\sigma_{1k}^2 = g(\theta_k)$ and $\sigma_{2k}^2 = g(\eta_k)$ for some continuous function $g(\cdot)$ with bounded first derivative. Then $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$

implies $\sup_k |\sigma_{1k} - \sigma_{2k}| \rightarrow 0$. Under the assumptions given in Theorem 2.2(b), if $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, the asymptotic variance V_{LSE} of $n\|\theta - \eta\|_2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)$ is

$$V_{LSE} = \left(\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2} \right)^2 V = \left(\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 \sigma_{2k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2} \right)^2 V.$$

As the arithmetic mean is bigger than the harmonic mean and by Cramér-Rao lower bound, $\sigma_{1k}^2 \geq (I(\theta_k))^{-1}$, $\sigma_{2k}^2 \geq (I(\eta_k))^{-1}$ for all $k \geq 1$, we have $V_{MLE} \leq V_{LSE}$. A similar conclusion holds when $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow c$ and \mathcal{K}_0 is the empty set.

3.1 Illustrative Examples

We showcase the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE}$, when the data generating mechanism for $\{X_{kt}\}$ follows specific probability distributions, including those in the exponential family (full rank as well as curved) and some models of particular interest in econometrics, namely, the 0-inflated Poisson for count data, as well as the Probit and Tobit models. We illustrate how Assumptions (B1)-(B10) hold for these models and also provide comparisons between the least squares and maximum likelihood estimators of the change point for these examples. Apart from the one parameter full rank exponential family, together with the 0-inflated Poisson, Probit and Tobit models, all other ones are discussed in the Supplementary file in the interests of space.

Example 3.1. Exponential family. A random variable X belongs to the one parameter natural exponential family, if its probability density/mass function has the form

$$f_\lambda(x) = e^{\lambda x - \beta(\lambda) + h(x)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \lambda \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}, \quad (3.14)$$

where $\beta(\lambda) = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x + h(x)} dx$ is an infinitely differentiable convex function. Note that in this case, $E(X) = \beta'(\lambda)$ and $\text{Var}(X) = \beta''(\lambda)$. Since $\beta(\cdot)$ is a convex function, $\beta'(\cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function and therefore its inverse exists.

This example assumes that for each k and t , the probability distribution of X_{kt} belongs to the one parameter natural exponential family and the break occurs due to change in the value of the parameter. This is equivalent to positing that the probability density/mass function of X_{kt} is

$$f_{kt}(x) = f_{\theta_k}(x)I(t \leq \tau_n) + f_{\eta_k}(x)I(t > \tau_n), \quad (3.15)$$

where $\theta_k \neq \eta_k$ for at least one $k \geq 1$.

Following the developments in Section 3, one can establish the conclusions of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2(a) when the second derivative of $\beta(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ is bounded away from both 0 and ∞ , the 4-th moment of X_{kt} is uniformly bounded above and (SNR2) holds.

Further, suppose that the third derivative of $\beta(\cdot)$ is bounded. Then, the conclusion of Theorem 3.2(b) holds for the model in (3.15,) if γ_{MLE} exists. In addition, the conclusion of Theorem 3.2(b) holds for (3.15), if γ_{MLE}^* exists and, (A4), (B10) and $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\theta_k - \eta_k| \rightarrow 0$ hold.

Note that in this example, $E(X_{kt}) \neq \theta_k I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \eta_k I(t > n\tau_n)$ and therefore, we can not not apply Remark 3.3 directly. However, using the structure of the exponential family, one can establish similar variance comparisons as given in Remark 3.3 for the model (3.15).

For the Gaussian case, i.e., when $f_\lambda(x) = (\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2})^{-1} \exp\{-(x-\lambda)^2/\sigma^2\}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and known constant $\sigma > 0$, Condition (SNR2) can be relaxed to (SNR1). Also in this case, $\beta(\cdot) = C\lambda^2$ for some constant $C > 0$ and hence, all the requirements on $\beta(\cdot)$, as stated above, hold naturally.

Details are given in Example 6.5 of the supplement due to space constraint.

Example 3.2. 0-inflated Poisson distribution. A random variable X follows a 0-inflated Poisson distribution with parameter (σ, λ) ($0 < \sigma < 1$ and $\lambda > 0$), if X has the following probability mass function:

$$P(X = x) = (\sigma + (1 - \sigma)e^{-\lambda})I(x = 0) + (1 - \sigma)e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^x}{x!} I(x = 1, 2, \dots). \quad (3.16)$$

In this model, the maximum likelihood method is recommended over least squares because the latter method relies on the means to detect the change point. However, for this model $E(X) = (1 - \sigma)\lambda$ and it is easy to come up with scenarios where two different pairs of (σ, λ) (e.g. $(0.5, 2)$ and $(2/3, 3)$) end up with the same (or very similar) mean(s). In that case, the least squares based method would fail to detect the change point, while the maximum likelihood one would not, provided that the other conditions required and previously discussed hold.

It can then easily be seen that assumptions (B1) and (B2) hold for this example. The log-likelihood of (σ, λ) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L(\sigma, \Lambda) &= (\log(\sigma + (1 - \sigma)e^{-\lambda}))I(x = 0) + (\log(1 - \sigma) - \lambda + x \log \lambda - \log(x!))I(x = 1, 2, \dots) \\ &= (\log(\sigma + (1 - \sigma)e^{-\lambda}))I(x = 0) + (\log(1 - \sigma) - \lambda)I(x = 1, 2, \dots) \\ &\quad + x(\log \lambda)I(x = 1, 2, \dots) - (\log(x!))I(x = 1, 2, \dots). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Thus, (B4) holds. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 L(\sigma, \lambda)}{\partial \lambda^2} &= \frac{(1-\sigma)e^{-\lambda}}{\sigma + (1-\sigma)e^{-\lambda}} \left(1 - \frac{(1-\sigma)e^{-\lambda}}{\sigma + (1-\sigma)e^{-\lambda}} \right) I(x=0) - \lambda^{-2} x I(x=1, 2, \dots), \\
\frac{\partial^2 L(\sigma, \lambda)}{\partial \sigma \partial \lambda} &= \left[\frac{(1-\sigma)e^{-\lambda}(1-e^{-\lambda})}{(\sigma + (1-\sigma)e^{-\lambda})^2} + \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{(\sigma + (1-\sigma)e^{-\lambda})} \right] I(x=0), \\
\frac{\partial^2 L(\sigma, \lambda)}{\partial \sigma^2} &= - \left(\frac{(1-e^{-\lambda})}{(\sigma + (1-\sigma)e^{-\lambda})} \right)^2 I(x=0) - \frac{1}{(1-\sigma)^2} I(x=1, 2, \dots).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Consider the following three measurable functions on the set of all non-negative integers:

$$G_{11}(x) = I(x=0) + xI(x=1, 2, \dots), \quad G_{12}(x) = I(x=0) \text{ and } G_{22}(x) = 1. \tag{3.19}$$

Note that the above functions satisfy (3.3). For some fixed $0 < c_1 < 1$ and $0 < c_2 < c_3 < \infty$, define the restricted parameter space

$$\Lambda = \{(\sigma, \lambda) : \sigma \in (c_1, 1 - c_1), \lambda \in (c_2, c_3)\}. \tag{3.20}$$

Then, for some $0 < C_1 \leq C_2 < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 < C_1 G_{11}(x) &\leq \sup_{(\sigma, \lambda) \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{\partial^2 L(\sigma, \lambda)}{\partial \lambda^2} \right| \leq C_2 G_{11}(x) < \infty, \\
0 < C_1 G_{12}(x) &\leq \sup_{(\sigma, \lambda) \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{\partial^2 L(\sigma, \lambda)}{\partial \sigma \partial \lambda} \right| \leq C_2 G_{12}(x) < \infty, \\
0 < C_1 G_{22}(x) &\leq \sup_{(\sigma, \lambda) \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{\partial^2 L(\sigma, \lambda)}{\partial \sigma^2} \right| \leq C_2 G_{22}(x) < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, (B5) holds for this example. Moreover, (B6), (B8), (B9) and (B11) hold for the parameter space Λ defined in (3.20).

Suppose the data $\{X_{kt}\}$ are generated from the 0-inflated Poisson with parameter

$$(\sigma_{1k}, \lambda_{1k})I(t \leq n\tau_n) + (\sigma_{2k}, \lambda_{2k})I(t > n\tau_n) \quad \forall k \geq 1,$$

where $(\sigma_{1k}, \lambda_{1k}) \neq (\sigma_{2k}, \lambda_{2k})$ for at least one k . We obtain $\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{MLE}}$ by (3.5).

Suppose $(\sigma, \lambda) \in \Lambda$, (SNR2) holds and $\log m(n) = o(n)$. Then,

$$n \left(\sum_{k=1}^n (\sigma_{1k} - \sigma_{2k})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n (\lambda_{1k} - \lambda_{2k})^2 \right) (\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{MLE}} - \tau_n) = O_P(1). \tag{3.21}$$

Under the above assumptions and $(\sum_{k=1}^n(\sigma_{1k} - \sigma_{2k})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n(\lambda_{1k} - \lambda_{2k})^2) \rightarrow \infty$,

$$P(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} = \tau_n) \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.22)$$

Further, suppose γ_{MLE} and γ_{MLE}^* exist respectively, when $(\sum_{k=1}^n(\sigma_{1k} - \sigma_{2k})^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n(\lambda_{1k} - \lambda_{2k})^2) \rightarrow 0$ and $C > 0$. Moreover, suppose $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n}(|\sigma_{1k} - \sigma_{2k}| + |\lambda_{1k} - \lambda_{2k}|) \rightarrow 0$, (A4) and (B10) hold for the latter case. Then, the conclusions of Theorem 3.2(b) and (c) continue to hold. Note that in the last two regimes, (SNR2) implies $m(n) = o(\sqrt{n})$, which is stronger than $\log m(n) = o(n)$.

Example 3.3. Probit model. Suppose a response variable X is binary, that is it can have only two possible outcomes which we will denote as 1 and 0. We also have a predictor vector $Y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, which is assumed to influence the outcome X . The probit model is then defined as $P(X = 1) = \Phi(Y'\beta)$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the distribution function of the standard Gaussian variable and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the parameter vector of interest. Clearly this model satisfies (B1), (B2) and (B3).

The log-likelihood of β is given by $L(\beta) = X \log \Phi(Y'\beta) + (1 - X) \log(1 - \Phi(Y'\beta))$. Therefore, (B4) holds. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\Phi'(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \Phi(x)$ and $\Phi''(x) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \Phi(x)$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} L(\beta) = - \left(\frac{x - \Phi(Y'\beta)}{\Phi(Y'\beta)(1 - \Phi(Y'\beta))} \Phi'(Y'\beta) \right)^2 YY' + \frac{x - \Phi(Y'\beta)}{\Phi(Y'\beta)(1 - \Phi(Y'\beta))} \Phi''(Y'\beta) YY'.$$

Moreover, as $\Phi''(x) = -x\Phi'(x)$, on simplification, we get

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} L(\beta) = - \left(\frac{x - \Phi(Y'\beta)}{\Phi(Y'\beta)(1 - \Phi(Y'\beta))} \Phi'(Y'\beta) \right) \left(x + \frac{x - \Phi(Y'\beta)}{\Phi(Y'\beta)(1 - \Phi(Y'\beta))} \Phi'(Y'\beta) \right) YY'.$$

Suppose both Y and β belong to a compact subset Λ of \mathbb{R}^d , so that $0 < C_1 \leq Y'\beta \leq C_2 < \infty$.

Then, it is easy to see that for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$

$$0 < C_1 J_d \leq \inf_{y, \beta \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} L(\beta) \right| \leq \sup_{y, \beta \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} L(\beta) \right| < C_2 J_d < \infty.$$

Therefore, (B5) holds with $G_2 = C J_d$ for some $C > 0$.

Further, since X is a bounded random variable and y, β belong to a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d , Assumptions (B6) and (B7) are satisfied. In addition, (B8) and (B9) hold, since X is Sub-Gaussian and G_2 is a constant function. Analogously, it is seen that (B11) holds.

Suppose $\{X_{kt}\}$ are independently generated from the Probit model with parameter

$$\beta_{1k}(n)I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \beta_{2k}(n)I(t > n\tau_n) \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

For ease of presentation, we shall write β_{1k} and β_{2k} , respectively, for $\beta_{1k}(n)$ and $\beta_{2k}(n)$. Further, $\beta_{1k} \neq \beta_{2k}$ for at least one k . Let $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=1}^m \|\beta_{1k} - \beta_{2k}\|_2^2$. Suppose $Y, \beta \in \Lambda$, (SNR2) holds and $\log m(n) = o(n)$. Then, $n\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n) = O_P(1)$ and when $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2^2 \rightarrow \infty$, we have $P(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} = \tau_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Further, suppose γ_{MLE} and γ_{MLE}^* exist respectively, when $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0$ and $C > 0$. In addition, suppose $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\beta_{1k} - \beta_{2k}|_2 \rightarrow 0$, (A4) and (B10) hold for the latter case. Then, the conclusions of Theorem 3.2(b) and (c) continue to hold. Again as in previous examples, for the last two regimes, (SNR2) implies the stronger assumption $m(n) = o(\sqrt{n})$ than $\log m(n) = o(n)$.

Example 3.4. Tobit model. In this model, the response variable X depends on a $d \times 1$ vector predictor Y as $X = (Y'\beta + \varepsilon)I(\varepsilon > -Y'\beta)$, where $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and β is a $d \times 1$ parameter vector. Though Assumptions (B1), (B2) and (B3) hold for this model, since X has neither a probability density, nor a mass function, there may not always exist a consistent solution of the joint log-likelihood equation (3.1). Amemiya (1973) established that (3.1) has a consistent sequence of solutions, if for a given data set $\{(X_i, Y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, the following (T1) and (T2) conditions hold.

(T1) The empirical distribution of $\{Y_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ converges weakly to some probability distribution.

(T2) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Y_i'$ is positive definite.

The log-likelihood function of β is given by

$$L(\beta) = (1 - \Phi(Y'\beta))I(X = 0) - 0.5(X - Y'\beta)^2 I(X > 0) + C$$

for some constant C . Thus, Assumption (B4) holds. Let $\Phi''(x) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \Phi(x)$. Then,

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \beta^2} L(\beta) = -\Phi''(Y'\beta)YY'I(X = 0) - YY'I(X > 0).$$

Suppose both Y and β belong to a compact subset Λ of \mathbb{R}^d , so that $0 < C_1 \leq Y'\beta \leq C_2 < \infty$. Therefore, (B5) holds with $G_2(x) = C$ for all x and for some $C > 0$. Similarly (B11) holds.

Moreover, it is easy to see that (B8) and (B9) are satisfied for this model.

Suppose $\{X_{kt}\}$ are independently generated with

$$X_{kt} = \begin{cases} (Y'_{kt}\beta_{1k}(n) + \varepsilon_{kt})I(\varepsilon_{kt} > -Y'_{kt}\beta_{1k}(n)), & \text{if } t \leq n\tau_n \\ (Y'_{kt}\beta_{2k}(n) + \varepsilon_{kt})I(\varepsilon_{kt}(n) > -Y'_{kt}\beta_{2k}(n)), & \text{if } t \leq n\tau_n \end{cases} \quad (3.23)$$

where $\{\varepsilon_{kt}\}$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables and $\beta_{1k}(n) \neq \beta_{2k}(n)$ for at least one k . We shall write β_{1k} and β_{2k} respectively, for $\beta_{1k}(n)$ and $\beta_{2k}(n)$. Suppose for each $k \geq 1$, $\{Y_{kt} : t \leq n\tau_n\}$ and $\{Y_{kt} : t \geq n\tau_n\}$ satisfy (T1) and (T2) and $Y, \beta \in \Lambda$. Then, under (SNR2) and $\log m(n) = o(n)$, we have $n\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n) = O_P(1)$ and when $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2^2 \rightarrow \infty$, we have $P(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} = \tau_n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Further, suppose γ_{MLE} and γ_{MLE}^* exist respectively, when $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0$ and $C > 0$. Moreover, suppose $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\beta_{1k} - \beta_{2k}|_2 \rightarrow 0$, (A4) and (B10) hold for the latter case. Then, the conclusions of Theorem 3.2(b) and (c) continue to hold. Again as in previous examples, for the last two regimes, (SNR2) implies the more strong assumption $m(n) = o(\sqrt{n})$ than the required $\log m(n) = o(n)$.

Remark 3.4. *In this work, we do not pursue the investigation of ML estimation of the change point under dependence, since the likelihood will depend on the temporal dependence posited and can become exceedingly complicated.*

4 Adaptive inference for the asymptotic distribution of the change-point estimate

In Sections 2 and 3, we derived point estimates $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$ and $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$ of the change point τ_n and established their convergence rates and asymptotic distributions, respectively. However, the results in Theorems 2.2 and 3.2 identify three different limiting regimes depending on the behavior of the norm difference of the parameters before and after the change point. The latter norm difference is *not a priori known*, and hence the practitioner is left with the dilemma of which regime to use for construction of confidence intervals. Next, we present a *data based adaptive procedure* to determine the quantiles of the asymptotic distribution, irrespective of the specific regime pertaining to the data at hand.

4.1 Adaptive inference for the least squares estimator

Recall the observed data set $\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}$. Let $\mathbb{P}_{\mu, \sigma^2, \theta}$ be a probability distribution which is fully characterized by its mean μ , variance σ^2 and the $d \times 1$ parameter vector θ . Therefore,

$$\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x d\mathbb{P}_{\mu, \sigma^2, \theta} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (x - \mu)^2 d\mathbb{P}_{\mu, \sigma^2, \theta}.$$

μ , σ^2 and θ may not be functionally independent. We denote the pre- and post-change point probability distributions of X_{kt} by $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{1k}(n), \sigma_{1k}^2(n), \theta_{1k}(n)}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mu_{2k}(n), \sigma_{2k}^2(n), \theta_{2k}(n)}$, respectively. For ease of exposition, we shall write μ_{ik} , σ_{ik}^2 and θ_{ik} , respectively, for $\mu_{1k}(n)$, $\sigma_{1k}^2(n)$ and $\theta_{1k}(n)$. Let $\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}$ be the least squares estimator of the change point τ_n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_{1k} &= \frac{1}{n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}} \sum_{t=1}^{n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}} X_{kt}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2 = \frac{1}{n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}} \sum_{t=1}^{n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}} (X_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})^2, \\ \hat{\mu}_{2k} &= \frac{1}{n(1 - \hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}})} \sum_{t=n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}+1}^n X_{kt}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_{2k}^2 = \frac{1}{n(1 - \hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}})} \sum_{t=n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}+1}^n (X_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \end{aligned}$$

and $\hat{\theta}_{ik}$ be an estimator of θ_{ik} , such that $\hat{\theta}_{ik} - \theta_{ik} \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $\forall k \geq 1, i = 1, 2$. If $\sigma^2 = g(\mu)$ and $\theta = h(\mu, \sigma^2)$ for some functions g and h , then we consider $\hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 = g(\hat{\mu}_{ik})$ and $\hat{\theta}_{ik} = h(\hat{\mu}_{ik}, \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2)$. Moreover, if $\theta = h(\mu, \sigma^2, \eta)$ for some function h and η does not depend on μ and σ^2 , then $\hat{\theta}_{ik} = h(\hat{\mu}_{ik}, \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2, \hat{\eta}_{ik})$ where $\hat{\eta}_{ik} - \eta_{ik} \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $\forall k \geq 1, i = 1, 2$.

Generate independent random variables $\{\tilde{X}_{kt, \text{LSE}} : k, t \geq 1\}$, where for each $k \geq 1$,

$$\tilde{X}_{kt, \text{LSE}} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mu}_{1k}, \hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2, \hat{\theta}_{1k}} I(t \leq n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}) + \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mu}_{2k}, \hat{\sigma}_{2k}^2, \hat{\theta}_{2k}} I(t > n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}). \quad (4.1)$$

The least squares criterion function is given by

$$\tilde{M}_n(h) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}+h} (\tilde{X}_{kt, \text{LSE}} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})^2 + \sum_{t=n\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}+h+1}^n (\tilde{X}_{kt, \text{LSE}} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \right], \quad (4.2)$$

and define $\tilde{h}_{n, \text{LSE}} = \arg \max\{\tilde{M}_n(h) : h \in [n(c^* - \hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}), n(1 - c^* - \hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}})]\}$. Note that $\tilde{h}_{n, \text{LSE}}$ can take both positive and negative values as $c^* < \hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}} < 1 - c^*$.

The following theorem states the asymptotic distribution of $\tilde{h}_{n, \text{LSE}}$. In **Regime (a)**: $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, we need the same assumptions as in Theorem 2.2(a). In **Regime (b)**, $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ additional assumptions are required, beyond those posited in Theorem 2.2(b), as well as a

stronger signal-to-noise condition. These are:

(A8) $\{X_{kt}\}$ are Sub-Gaussian, and

(SNR3) $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log m}} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{m} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

To prove our result, at a certain point, we need to establish that

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2} \xrightarrow{P} \gamma_{L,LSE}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{2k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2} \xrightarrow{P} \gamma_{R,LSE}^2. \quad (4.3)$$

(A8) and (SNR3) are needed to show the convergences in (4.3).

Next, we consider **Regime (c)**: $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Recall the partition of the index set $\{1, 2, \dots, m(n)\}$ into \mathcal{K}_0 and \mathcal{K}_n . Further, recall assumptions (A4) and (A5) on the set \mathcal{K}_0 , where we assume that \mathcal{K}_0 does not vary with n and, for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$ and $0 < f < 1$, $X_{k\lfloor nf \rfloor} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} X_{1k}^* I(f \leq \tau^*) + X_{2k}^* I(f > \tau^*)$ and $\mu_{ik}(n) \rightarrow \mu_{ik}^*$, $i = 1, 2$. By assumptions (A8) and (SNR3), $\hat{\mu}_{ik}(n) - \mu_{ik}(n) \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $k \in \mathcal{K}_0, i = 1, 2$. To ensure $\tilde{X}_{k\lfloor nf \rfloor, LSE} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} X_{1k}^* I(f \leq \tau^*) + X_{2k}^* I(f > \tau^*)$ and $\hat{\mu}_{ik} \xrightarrow{P} \mu_{ik}^*$, we need the following assumptions.

Let $X_n \sim \mathbb{P}_{\mu_n, \sigma_n^2, \theta_n}$ and $X \sim \mathbb{P}_{\mu, \sigma^2, \theta}$.

(A9) $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} X$, if and only if $(\mu_n, \sigma_n^2, \theta_n) \rightarrow (\mu, \sigma^2, \theta)$.

(A10) $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau^*$ and for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0, i=1,2$, $(\mu_{ik}(n), \sigma_{ik}^2(n), \theta_{ik}(n)) \rightarrow (\mu_{ik}^*, \sigma_{ik}^{*2}, \theta_{ik}^*)$.

Note that (A9) and (A10) together imply (A5) and, X_{1k}^* and X_{2k}^* come from the same family of distributions as the data. Since the convergence in Regime (b) is similar to that on \mathcal{K}_n , we require (A8) on \mathcal{K}_n and (SNR3) in addition to the assumptions in Theorem 2.2(c).

We can then establish the following result, whose proof is delegated to Section 5.7.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose (A1) holds. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *Under (SNR1) and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, $P(\tilde{h}_{n,LSE} = 0) \rightarrow 1$.*

(b) *Suppose (A2), (A3), (A8) and (SNR3) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Then,*

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \tilde{h}_{n,LSE} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + \gamma_{L,LSE} B_h I(h \leq 0) + \gamma_{R,LSE} B_h I(h > 0)),$$

where B_h denotes the standard Brownian motion.

(c) Suppose (A4), (A6), (A7)-(A10) and (SNR3) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Then,

$$\tilde{h}_{n,LSE} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (D_1(h) + C_1(h) + A_1(h)),$$

where for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(h+1) - D_1(h) &= -0.5 \text{Sign}(h) c_1^2, \\ C_1(h+1) - C_1(h) &= (\gamma_{L,LSE}^* I(h \leq 0) + \gamma_{R,LSE}^* I(h > 0)) W_h, \quad W_h \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \\ A_1(h+1) - A_1(h) &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} \left[(Z_{kh} - \mu_{1k}^*)^2 - (Z_{kh} - \mu_{2k}^*)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

$\{Z_{kh}\}$ are independently distributed with $Z_{kh} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{1k}^*, \sigma_{1k}^{*2}, \theta_{1k}^*} I(h \leq 0) + \mathbb{P}_{\mu_{2k}^*, \sigma_{2k}^{*2}, \theta_{2k}^*} I(h > 0)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$. Moreover, if $\sigma_{ik}^2 = \sigma_i^2$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$, then (SNR3) in (b) and (c) can be relaxed to (SNR1).

The upshot of this Theorem is that the asymptotic distributions of $\tilde{h}_{n,LSE}$ and $n(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)$ are *identical for all regimes*. Therefore, in practice we can simulate $\tilde{h}_{n,LSE}$ for a large number of replicates and its sample quantiles will be good estimators for the quantiles of the limiting distribution *under the true regime*. Although this is a computationally expensive procedure, it is nevertheless *trivially parallelizable*.

However, adaptive inference comes at a certain cost, namely the requirement for assumption (SNR3). The reason for assuming (SNR3) is explained after stating (A8) and (SNR3) and is difficult to relax.

4.2 Adaptive inference for the maximum likelihood estimates of the change point

Consider the set of probability mass/density functions $\{\mathbb{P}_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ which satisfy (B1)-(B3). The observed data $\{X_{kt} : 1 \leq t \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq m\}$ are independently generated according to

$$X_{kt} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k(n)} I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k(n)} I(t > n\tau_n), \quad k \geq 1.$$

Let $\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE}$ be the maximum likelihood estimator of the change point τ_n based on the data set $\{X_{kt} : 1 \leq t \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq m\}$. Further, let $\hat{\theta}_k(n)$ and $\hat{\eta}_k(n)$ be respectively the solutions of the

log-likelihood equation

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t=n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}+1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \log \mathbb{P}_\eta(X_{kt}) = 0.$$

Existence of such solutions is guaranteed by (B1)-(B3).

Generate independent random variables $\{\tilde{X}_{kt,\text{MLE}} : k, t \geq 1\}$ by

$$\tilde{X}_{kt,\text{MLE}} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_k(n)} I(t \leq n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}) + \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\eta}_k(n)} I(t > n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}), \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

For ease of exposition, we shall write θ_k , η_k , $\hat{\theta}_k$ and $\hat{\eta}_k$ respectively, for $\theta_k(n)$, $\eta_k(n)$, $\hat{\theta}_k(n)$ and $\hat{\eta}_k(n)$. Consider the maximum likelihood criterion function

$$\tilde{L}_n(h) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}+h} \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_k}(\tilde{X}_{kt,\text{MLE}}) + \sum_{t=n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}+h+1}^n \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\eta}_k}(\tilde{X}_{kt,\text{MLE}}) \right],$$

and let $\tilde{h}_{n,\text{MLE}} = \arg \max\{\tilde{L}_n(h) : h \in [n(c^* - \hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}), n(1 - c^* - \hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}})]\}$.

Consider the following assumptions for Regime (c): $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Let $X_n \sim \mathbb{P}_{\lambda_n}$ and $X \sim \mathbb{P}_\lambda$.

(B12) $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} X$, if and only if $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$. $\mathbb{P}_\lambda(x)$ is a continuous function of λ and x .

(B13) $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau^*$ and for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$, $(\theta_k(n), \eta_k(n)) \rightarrow (\theta_k^*, \eta_k^*)$.

The following Theorem states the asymptotic distribution of $\tilde{h}_{n,\text{MLE}}$ and its proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1 and therefore omitted.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose (B1)-(B6), (B8) and (B9) hold. Then, the following statements hold.*

(a) *If (SNR2) holds, $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, $\log m(n) = o(n)$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\tilde{h}_{n,\text{MLE}} = 0) = 1$.*

(b) *If γ_{MLE} exists, (B11) and (SNR3) hold and $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, then*

$$\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2 \tilde{h}_{n,\text{MLE}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5\gamma_{\text{MLE}}^2 |h| + \gamma_{\text{MLE}} B_h) = \gamma_{\text{MLE}}^{-2} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h),$$

where B_h denotes the standard Brownian motion.

(c) *Suppose γ_{MLE}^* exists, (A4), (B11)-(B13) and (SNR3) hold, $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\theta_k - \eta_k| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\theta -$*

$\eta||_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, then

$$\tilde{h}_{n,MLE} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (D_2(h) + C_2(h) + A_2(h)),$$

where for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_2(h+1) - D_2(h) &= -0.5 \text{Sign}(h) \gamma_{MLE}^{*2}, \\ C_2(h+1) - C_2(h) &= \gamma_{MLE}^* W_h, \quad W_h \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \\ A_2(h+1) - A_2(h) &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} \left(\log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k^*}(Z_{kh}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k^*}(Z_{kh}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and $\{Z_{kh}\}$ are independently distributed with $Z_{kh} \sim \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k^*} I(h \leq 0) + \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k^*} I(h > 0)$, $k \in \mathcal{K}_0$.

Further, if $G_2(x)$ in (B5) does not depend on x , i.e. it is a constant function, then (B6) can be relaxed to (B7).

Remark 4.1. Suppose $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(x) = -\Sigma$ for all λ , x and for some positive definite matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ which does not depend on λ and x . This is equivalent to saying that for each $k \geq 1$, $X_{kt} \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\theta_k, \Gamma) I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mathcal{N}_d(\eta_k, \Gamma) I(t > n\tau_n)$, $\theta_k \neq \eta_k$ for at least one k and for some known $d \times d$ positive definite matrix Γ . Then, the asymptotic distribution in (a) continues to hold under the weaker assumptions (B7) and (SNR1).

Moreover, if $I(\theta_k) = I_1$ and $I(\eta_k) = I_2$ for all $k \geq 1$, then (SNR3) in (b) and (c) can be relaxed to (SNR2).

5 Proofs

5.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

We use the following lemma to prove this theorem. This is quoted from [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#).

Lemma 5.1. For each n , let \mathbb{M}_n and $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n$ be stochastic processes indexed by a set \mathcal{T} . Let τ_n (possibly random) $\in \mathcal{T}_n \subset \mathcal{T}$ and $d_n(b, \tau_n)$ be a map (possibly random) from \mathcal{T} to $[0, \infty)$. Suppose that for every large n and $\delta \in (0, \infty)$

$$\sup_{\delta/2 < d_n(b, \tau_n) < \delta, b \in \mathcal{T}} (\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(b) - \tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(\tau_n)) \leq -C\delta^2, \quad (5.1)$$

$$E \sup_{\delta/2 < d_n(b, \tau_n) < \delta, b \in \mathcal{T}} \sqrt{n} |\mathbb{M}_n(b) - \mathbb{M}_n(\tau_n) - (\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(b) - \tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(\tau_n))| \leq C\phi_n(\delta), \quad (5.2)$$

for some $C > 0$ and for function ϕ_n such that $\delta^{-\alpha}\phi_n(\delta)$ is decreasing in δ on $(0, \infty)$ for some $\alpha < 2$. Let r_n satisfy

$$r_n^2 \phi(r_n^{-1}) \leq \sqrt{n} \text{ for every } n. \quad (5.3)$$

Further, suppose that the sequence $\{\hat{\tau}_n\}$ takes its values in \mathcal{T}_n and satisfies $\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{\tau}_n) \geq \mathbb{M}_n(\tau_n) - O_P(r_n^{-2})$ for large enough n . Then, $r_n d_n(\hat{\tau}_n, \tau_n) = O_P(1)$.

Recall that the least squares estimator $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$ of τ_n from (2.1). For our purpose, we make use of the above lemma with $\mathbb{M}_n = M_n$, $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n = EM_n$, $\mathcal{T} = [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{T}_n = \{1/n, 2/n, \dots, (n-1)/n, 1\} \cap [c^*, 1 - c^*]$, $d_n(b, \tau_n) = \|\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}\|_2 \sqrt{|b - \tau_n|}$, $\phi_n(\delta) = \delta$, $\alpha = 1.5$, $r_n = \sqrt{n}$ and $\hat{\tau}_n = \hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$. Thus, to prove Theorem 2.1, it is enough to establish that for some $C > 0$,

$$E(M_n(b) - M_n(\tau_n)) \leq -C\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 |b - \tau_n| \text{ and} \quad (5.4)$$

$$E \sup_{\delta/2 < d_n(b, \tau_n) < \delta, b \in \mathcal{T}} |M_n(b) - M_n(\tau_n) - E(M_n(b) - M_n(\tau_n))| \leq C \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (5.5)$$

Note that the left hand side of (5.5) is dominated by

$$\left(E \sup_{\delta/2 < d_n(b, \tau_n) < \delta, b \in \mathcal{T}} (M_n(b) - M_n(\tau_n) - E(M_n(b) - M_n(\tau_n)))^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (5.6)$$

By Doob's martingale inequality, (5.6) is further dominated by

$$(\text{Var}(M_n(b) - M_n(\tau_n)))^{1/2} \text{ where } d_n(b, \tau_n) = \delta. \quad (5.7)$$

Thus, to prove (5.5), it is enough to show that for some $C > 0$,

$$\text{Var}(M_n(b) - M_n(\tau_n)) \leq Cn^{-1}d_n^2(b, \tau_n). \quad (5.8)$$

Hence, it is enough to prove (5.4) and (5.8) to establish Theorem 2.1.

Next, we write $(M_n(b) - M_n(\tau_n))$ as a sum of some processes, so that computing means and variances becomes easier. We first introduce some notation that facilitates the presentation. We also write τ for τ_n .

Additional notation.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mu}_k(a, b) &= \frac{1}{n|b-a|} \sum_{t=n(a \wedge b)+1}^{n(a \vee b)} X_{kt}, \\
T_{1k}(b) &= b(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b) - \hat{\mu}_{1k}(\tau))^2, \quad T_{2k}(b) = -(1-\tau)(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b) - \hat{\mu}_{2k}(\tau))^2, \\
T_{3k}(b) &= (\tau-b) \left[(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(\tau) - \hat{\mu}_k(b, \tau))^2 - (\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b) - \hat{\mu}_k(b, \tau))^2 \right], \\
N_{1k}(b) &= (\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b) - E(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b))), \quad N_{2k}(b) = (\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b) - E(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b))), \\
N_{3k}(a, b) &= (\hat{\mu}_k(a, b) - E(\hat{\mu}_k(a, b))), \quad N_{4k} = (E(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(\tau)) - E(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(\tau))).
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\hat{\mu}_k(b, \tau)) &= E(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(\tau))I(b < \tau) + E(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(\tau))I(b > \tau), \quad (5.9) \\
E(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b)) - E(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(\tau)) &= -\left(\frac{1-\tau}{1-b}I(b < \tau) + I(b > \tau)\right)N_{4k}, \\
E(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b)) - E(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(\tau)) &= \frac{\tau-b}{1-b}I(b < \tau)N_{4k}, \\
E(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b)) - E(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(\tau)) &= -\frac{b-\tau}{b}I(b > \tau)N_{4k}, \\
E(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b)) - E(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(\tau)) &= \left(\frac{\tau}{b}I(b > \tau) + I(b < \tau)\right)N_{4k}. \quad (5.10)
\end{aligned}$$

Assume $b < \tau$. Using above notations and (5.9)-(5.10), the following relations follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{1k}(b) &= b\tau^{-2}(\tau-b)^2(N_{1k}^2(b) + N_{3k}^2(b, \tau) + 2N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)), \\
T_{2k}(b) &= -(1-\tau)(1-b)^{-2}(\tau-b)^2(N_{2k}^2(\tau) + N_{3k}^2(b, \tau) + N_{4k}^2 - 2N_{2k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau) \\
&\quad - 2N_{3k}(b, \tau)N_{4k} + 2N_{2k}(\tau)N_{4k}), \\
T_{3k}(b) &= -(\tau-b)(N_{2k}^2(b) - N_{1k}^2(\tau) + (1-\tau)^{-2}(1-b)^2N_{4k}^2 - 2N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau) \\
&\quad - 2(1-\tau)^{-1}(1-b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)N_{4k} + 2(1-\tau)^{-1}(1-b)N_{2k}(b)N_{4k} \\
&\quad + 2N_{1k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)). \quad (5.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Further,

$$M_n(b) - M_n(\tau) = \sum_{k=1}^n (M_{k,n}(b) - M_{k,n}(\tau)) = \sum_{k=1}^m (T_{1k}(b) + T_{2k}(b) + T_{3k}(b)). \quad (5.12)$$

Thus, to prove (5.4) and (5.8), we need to calculate the expectation and the variance of $N_{ik}N_{jk}$ $\forall i, j, k$.

The following lemma proves useful to compute the expectation. Its proof is given in the Supplementary file.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $\sup_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) < \infty$. Then, for some $C > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k,b} E(N_{1k}^2(b)) &\leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{2k}^2(b)) \leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_k E(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau - b))^{-1}, \\ E(N_{4k}^2) &= N_{4k}^2, \quad \sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) = Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{2k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) = Cn^{-1}, \\ \sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{1k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &\leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq Cn^{-1}, \\ \sup_{k,b} E(N_{1k}(b)N_{4k}) &= 0, \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{2k}(b)N_{4k}) = 0, \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{3k}(b, \tau)N_{4k}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 5.2, for some $C, C_1 > 0$ we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^m ET_{1k}(b), \sum_{k=1}^m ET_{2k}(b) \leq C \frac{(\tau - b)m}{n}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^m ET_{3k}(b) \leq C \frac{(\tau - b)m}{n} - C_1(\tau - b) \sum_{k=1}^m N_{4k}^2.$$

Note that $\sum_{k=1}^m N_{4k}^2 = \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2$. Hence, by (SNR1), for some $C > 0$, $E(M_n(b) - M_n(\tau)) \leq -C(\tau - b)\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2$. Thus, (5.4) is established for $b < \tau$. A similar argument works for $b > \tau$.

Next, we compute the variance, for which the following lemma proves useful. Its proof is given in the Supplementary file.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose (A1) holds. Then, for some $C > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k,b} \text{Var}(N_{1k}^2(b)) &\leq Cn^{-2}, \quad \sup_{k,b} \text{Var}(N_{2k}^2(b)) \leq Cn^{-2}, \quad \sup_k \text{Var}(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) \leq Cn^{-2}(\tau - b)^{-2}, \\ \sup_k \text{Var}(N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &\leq Cn^{-2}(\tau - b)^{-2}, \quad \sup_k \text{Var}(N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq Cn^{-2}(\tau - b)^{-2} \\ \text{Var}(N_{4k}^2) &= 0, \quad \text{Var}(N_{4k}N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq CN_{4k}^2 n^{-1}(\tau - b)^{-1}, \quad \sup_b \text{Var}(N_{4k}N_{2k}(b)) \leq CN_{4k}^2 n^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 5.3 and (SNR1), we have for some $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^m \text{Var}(T_{1k}(b)) &\leq Cb^2\tau^{-4}(\tau - b)^4 \frac{m}{n^2}(1 + (\tau - b)^{-2}) \\ &\leq Cn^{-1}(mn^{-1}\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2})\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\tau - b) \leq Cn^{-1}d_n^2(b, \tau), \\ \sum_{k=1}^m \text{Var}(T_{2k}(b)) &\leq C(\tau - b)^4 \left(\frac{m}{n^2}(1 + (\tau - b)^{-2}) + \frac{1}{n}(\tau - b)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{4k}^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{4k}^2 \right), \\ &\leq Cn^{-1}d_n^2(b, \tau) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\sum_{k=1}^m \text{Var}(T_{3k}(b)) \leq Cn^{-1}d_n^2(b, \tau)$. Thus, (5.8) is established for $b < \tau$, and a

similar argument works for the case $b > \tau$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

Proof of (a). Note that $P(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} \neq \tau) = P(|\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} - \tau| \geq n^{-1}) \rightarrow 0$ since $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ and by Theorem 2.1, $n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} - \tau) = O_P(1)$.

Proof of (b). The following lemma from [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) proves useful in this proof.

Lemma 5.4. *Let \mathbb{M}_n and \mathbb{M} be two stochastic processes indexed by a metric space \mathcal{T} , such that $\mathbb{M}_n \Rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ in $l^\infty(K)$ for every compact set $K \subset \mathcal{T}$ i.e.,*

$$\sup_{h \in K} |\mathbb{M}_n(h) - \mathbb{M}(h)| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (5.13)$$

Suppose that almost all sample paths $h \rightarrow \mathbb{M}(h)$ are upper semi-continuous and possess a unique maximum at a (random) point \hat{h} , which as a random map in \mathcal{T} is tight. If the sequence \hat{h}_n is uniformly tight and satisfies $\mathbb{M}_n(\hat{h}_n) \geq \sup_n \mathbb{M}_n(h) - o_P(1)$, then $\hat{h}_n \xrightarrow{D} \hat{h}$ in \mathcal{T} .

To employ Lemma 5.4, we consider $\mathbb{M}_n(h) = n(M_n(b) - M_n(\tau))$ where $b = \tau + n^{-1}\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}h$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}$. To prove Theorem 2.2(b), by Lemma 5.4, it is enough to establish

$$\sup_{h \in K} |\mathbb{M}_n(h) + |h| - 2\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}} B_h I(h < 0) - 2\gamma_{\text{R,LSE}} B_h I(h > 0)| \rightarrow 0, \quad (5.14)$$

as $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, and for all compact subsets K of \mathbb{R} .

Note that by (5.12), we have $\mathbb{M}_n(h) = n \sum_{k=1}^m (T_{1k}(b) + T_{2k}(b) + T_{3k}(b))$.

First, we shall show that for any compact subset K of \mathbb{R} and as $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$,

$$\sup_{h \in K} \left| n \sum_{k=1}^m T_{1k}(b) \right|, \quad \sup_{h \in K} \left| n \sum_{k=1}^m T_{2k}(b) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (5.15)$$

$$\sup_{h \in K} \left| n \sum_{k=1}^m \left(T_{3k}(b) + \frac{|\tau - b|(1 - b)^2}{(1 - \tau)^2} N_{4k}^2 - 2 \frac{|\tau - b|(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau)} N_{3k}(b, \tau) N_{4k} \right) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (5.16)$$

Proof of (5.15) and (5.16). Note that by (5.11), Lemmas 5.2, 5.3 and (SNR1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \sup_{h \in K} \left| n \sum_{k=1}^m T_{1k}(b) \right| \\
& \leq C \sup_{h \in K} \left[n(\tau - b)^2 \sum_{k=1}^m \left[E(N_{1k}^2(b)) + E(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) + 2E|N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)| \right] \right] \\
& \leq C \sup_{h \in K} \left[n(\tau - b)^2 \sum_{k=1}^m \left[E(N_{1k}^2(b)) + E(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) + 2(\text{Var}(N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)))^{1/2} \right] \right] \\
& \leq C \frac{m}{n \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \\
& E \sup_{h \in K} \left| n \sum_{k=1}^m T_{2k}(b) \right| \\
& \leq C \sup_{h \in K} \left[n(\tau - b)^2 \sum_{k=1}^m \left(E(N_{2k}^2(\tau)) + E(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) + E(N_{4k}^2) + 2(\text{Var}(N_{2k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)))^{1/2} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + 2|N_{4k}|(\text{Var}(N_{3k}(b, \tau)))^{1/2} + 2|N_{4k}|(\text{Var}(N_{2k}(\tau)))^{1/2} \right) \right] \\
& \leq C \left[\frac{m}{n \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} + \frac{\sqrt{m}}{n^{3/2} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^3} \right] \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (5.15). A similar argument works for (5.16).

Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$\sup_{h \in K} \left| -\frac{n|\tau - b|(1 - b)^2}{(1 - \tau)^2} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{4k}^2 + |h| \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.17)$$

Therefore, by (5.15), (5.16) and (5.17), to prove (5.14), it remains to establish

$$\sup_{h \in K} \left| \frac{n|\tau - b|(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau)} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{3k}(b, \tau)N_{4k} - 2(\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}I(h < 0) + \gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}I(h > 0))B_h \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (5.18)$$

Since $\left\{ \frac{n|\tau - b|(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau)} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{3k}(b, \tau)N_{4k} \right\}$ is tight, to prove (5.18), it is enough to establish finite dimensional weak convergence. We shall show one dimensional convergence

$$\frac{n|\tau - b|(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau)} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{3k}(b, \tau)N_{4k} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} 2(h\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}I(h < 0) + h\gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}I(h > 0))\mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (5.19)$$

for $h \in K$, using a univariate central limit theorem.

Let $t_1^* = n\tau + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-1}hI(h < 0)$ and $t_2^* = n\tau + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}hI(h > 0)$. Note that $|t_1 - t_2| = \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}h$. Also let, $X_t^* = \sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \forall t$. Observe that $\{X_t^*\}$

are independent over t . Next,

$$\frac{n|\tau - b|(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau)} \sum_{k=1}^n N_{3k}(b, \tau) N_{4k} = \frac{1 - b}{1 - \tau} \sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} X_t^*. \quad (5.20)$$

By the Lyapunov central limit theorem, for a given $h \neq 0$, the right hand side of (5.20) converges to a Normally distributed random variable if

$$\left(\sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} E(X_t^{*2}) \right)^{-3/2} \left(\sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} E|X_t^*|^3 \right) \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.21)$$

(5.21) follows since

$$\sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} E|X_t^*|^3 \leq Ch \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m |\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}|^3}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} E(X_t^*)^2 \geq Ch \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-3}. \quad (5.22)$$

Therefore, the sequence of random variables in (5.20) converges weakly to a normal random variable with variance $h\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^2 I(h < 0) + h\gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^2 I(h > 0)$. This completes the proof of one dimensional convergence in (5.19). Similarly one can show finite dimensional convergence using a multivariate central limit theorem. This completes the proof of (5.18) and hence the proof of (5.14). Thus, Theorem 2.2(b) is established.

Proof of (c). It is easy to see that (5.15) and (5.16) hold if $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \frac{n|\tau - b|(1 - b)^2}{(1 - \tau)^2} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{4k}^2 + 2 \frac{n|\tau - b|(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau)} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{3k}(b, \tau) N_{4k} \\ &= - \frac{h(1 - b)^2}{(1 - \tau)^2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{4k}^2 + 2 \frac{h(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau) \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \sum_{k=1}^m N_{3k}(b, \tau) N_{4k} \\ &= A_n(h) + B_n(h), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_n(h) &= - \frac{|h|(1 - b)^2}{(1 - \tau)^2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} N_{4k}^2 + 2 \frac{|h|(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau) \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} N_{3k}(b, \tau) N_{4k}, \\ B_n(h) &= - \frac{|h|(1 - b)^2}{(1 - \tau)^2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} N_{4k}^2 + 2 \frac{|h|(1 - b)}{(1 - \tau) \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} N_{3k}(b, \tau) N_{4k} \\ &= B_{1n}(h) + B_{2n}(h) \quad \text{say.} \end{aligned}$$

As \mathcal{K}_0 is a finite set, by (A4) and (A5), one can easily see that for $h \in K$,

$$A_n(c^2(h+1)) - A_n(c^2h) \Rightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n^c} \left[(Z_{kh} - \mu_{1k}^*)^2 - (Z_{kh} - \mu_{2k}^*)^2 \right],$$

where $\{Z_{kh}\}$ are independently distributed with $Z_{kh} \stackrel{d}{=} X_{1k}^* I(h \leq 0) + X_{2k}^* I(h > 0)$.

Recall $c_1^2 = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2$, $h \in K$. Then clearly, $B_{1n}(h) \Rightarrow -|h|c^{-2}c_1^2$. Moreover,

$$B_{2n}(c^2(h+1)) - B_{2n}(C^2h) = 2 \frac{1-b}{1-\tau} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))$$

which weakly converges to a normal random variable if

$$\left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 E(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))^2 \right)^{3/2} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}|^3 E|X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})|^3 \right) \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.23)$$

By (A1), the above convergence in (5.23) holds if $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}|^3 \rightarrow 0$ and this is guaranteed by (A5). Hence,

$$B_{2n}(c^2(h+1)) - B_{2n}(C^2h) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} 2(\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^{*2} I(h < 0) + \gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^{*2} I(h > 0)) \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \quad (5.24)$$

Similarly one can establish finite dimensional weak convergence of $B_{2n}(c^2(h+1)) - B_{2n}(C^2h)$.

Moreover, $B_{2n}(c^2(h+1)) - B_{2n}(C^2h)$ is tight. Hence,

$$B_{2n}(c^2(h+1)) - B_{2n}(C^2h) \Rightarrow 2(\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^{*2} I(h < 0) + \gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^{*2} I(h > 0)) W_h \quad (5.25)$$

where $\{W_h\}$ are all independent standard normal random variables. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2(c). \square

5.3 Proof of Theorem 2.6

Theorem 2.6(a) follows from Theorem 2.5.

Proof of (b). (5.15), (5.16) and (5.17) are easy to establish under (D1), (D2) and (SNR1).

Let $t_1^* = n\tau + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-1} h I(h < 0)$ and $t_2^* = n\tau + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2} h I(h > 0)$. Note that

$|t_1 - t_2| = \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2} h$. Also let, $X_t^* = \sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \forall t$. Note that,

$$\frac{n|\tau - b|(1-b)}{(1-\tau)} \sum_{k=1}^n N_{3k}(b, \tau) N_{4k} = \frac{1-b}{1-\tau} \sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} X_t^*. \quad (5.26)$$

Now we shall establish weak convergence of the process in (5.26). Let $t_{1j}^* = n\tau + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-1} h_j I(h < 0)$, $t_{2j}^* = n\tau + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2} h_j I(h > 0)$ and $h_j \in K$, a compact subset of \mathbb{R} . By (D3) and for some $C > 0$, we have

$$\left| \text{Cum} \left(\sum_{t=t_{1j}^*+1}^{t_{2j}^*} X_t^* : 1 \leq j \leq r \right) \right| \leq C \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m |\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}|^r}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \forall r > 2.$$

Also, $\text{Cum} \left(\sum_{t=t_{1j_1}^*+1}^{t_{2j_1}^*} X_t^*, \sum_{t=t_{1j_2}^*+1}^{t_{2j_2}^*} X_t^* \right) \rightarrow \gamma_{(h_{j_1}, h_{j_2}), \text{DEP, LSE}}, \quad \forall 1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq r$. This proves finite dimensional weak convergence of the process (5.26). Therefore, by the tightness of (5.26), Theorem 2.6(b) is established.

Theorem 2.6(c) can be easily established if we use similar modifications on the proof of Theorem 2.2(c) as we have done above on the proof of Theorem 2.2(b) for proving Theorem 2.6(b).

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.6. \square

5.4 Justification of Example 2.5

Example 2.5(a) follows directly from Theorem 2.6(a). We use the following lemma to prove Example 2.5(b). This is quoted from Brockwell and Davis (2009).

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\{X_n : n \geq 1\}$ and $\{Y_{nj} : n, j \geq 1\}$ be random variables such that*

(i) $Y_{nj} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Y_j$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots$,

(ii) $Y_j \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Y$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, and

(iii) $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|X_n - Y_{nj}| > \epsilon) = 0$ for every $\epsilon > 0$.

Then $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Y$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k,t,C} = \varepsilon_{k,t} I(|\varepsilon_{k,t}| \leq C) - E(\varepsilon_{k,t} I(|\varepsilon_{k,t}| \leq C))$, $Y_{kt,C} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{k,j} \varepsilon_{k,t-j,C}$ and $X_{kt,C} = \mu_{1k} I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mu_{2k} I(t > n\tau_n) + Y_{kt,C}$ for all k, t and $C > 0$. Note that $\{X_{kt,C}\}$ satisfies (D1), (D2) and (D3). Let $\text{Var}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k,t,C}) = \sigma_{k\epsilon,C}^2$. Therefore, conclusion of Example 2.5(b) hold for the process

$\{X_{kt,C}\}$ with $\text{Cum}(X_{kt_1,C}, X_{kt_2,C}) = \sigma_{k\epsilon,C}^2 \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{k,j} a_{k,j+|t_2-t_1|} \right)$, $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, k \geq 1, C > 0$. This establishes Lemma 5.5(i) for all $C > 0$. Moreover, Lemma 5.5(ii) holds as $\sigma_{k\epsilon,C}^2 \rightarrow \sigma_{k\epsilon}^2$ as $C \rightarrow \infty$ and for all $k \geq 1$.

Let $t_1^* = n\tau + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-1} h I(h < 0)$, $t_2^* = n\tau + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2} h I(h > 0)$ and $h \in K$, a compact subset of \mathbb{R} . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\left| \sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} \sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})(Y_{tk} - Y_{tk,C}) \right| > \epsilon\right) \\ &= P\left(\left| \sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}) a_{k,j} (\varepsilon_{k,t-j,C} - \varepsilon_{k,t-j}) \right| > \epsilon\right) \\ &\leq \epsilon^{-2} E \left| \sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}) a_{k,j} (\varepsilon_{k,t-j,C} - \varepsilon_{k,t-j}) \right|^2 \\ &\leq C \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 a_{k,j}^2 |\sigma_{k\epsilon,C}^2 - \sigma_{k\epsilon}^2|}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as $\lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} |\sigma_{k\epsilon,C}^2 - \sigma_{k\epsilon}^2| = 0$, we have $\lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|\sum_{t=t_1^*+1}^{t_2^*} \sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})(Y_{tk} - Y_{tk,C})| > \epsilon) = 0$. Hence, Lemma 5.5(iii) holds.

Hence, by Lemma 5.5, Example 2.5(b) follows. \square

5.5 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We prove Theorem 3.1 for $d = 1$. Similar arguments work for finite $d > 1$. We employ the following lemma which follows easily from Lemma 5.1.

Lemma 5.6. *For each n , let \mathbb{M}_n and \mathbb{N}_n be stochastic processes on \mathcal{T} . Suppose τ_n , $d_n(\cdot, \tau_n)$ and r_n are as described in Lemma 5.1 and*

$$\lim P[\mathbb{N}_n(b) - \mathbb{N}_n(\tau_n) \leq C(\mathbb{M}_n(b) - \mathbb{M}_n(\tau_n)) \quad \forall b \in \mathcal{T}] = 1. \quad (5.27)$$

\mathbb{M}_n satisfies (5.1) and (5.2). Further suppose that the sequence $\{\hat{\tau}_n\}$ takes its values in \mathcal{T}_n and satisfies $\mathbb{N}_n(\hat{\tau}_n) \geq \mathbb{N}_n(\tau_n) - O_P(r_n^{-2})$ for large enough n . Then $r_n d_n(\hat{\tau}_n, \tau_n) = O_P(1)$.

Recall $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$ from (3.5). To employ Lemma 5.6, we take \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}_n as in the proof of

Theorem 2.1 and we also have

$$\mathbb{N}_n(b) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{L}_{k,n}(b). \quad (5.28)$$

Next, we obtain the process \mathbb{M}_n . To this end we define the following processes. We assume $b < \tau$. Similar arguments work for $b > \tau$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_{1k}(b) &= \left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) - \frac{1}{n\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^2, \\ \mathbb{M}_{2k}(b) &= \left(\frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) - \frac{1}{n(1-\tau)} \sum_{t=n\tau+1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^2, \\ \mathbb{M}_{3k}(b) &= (\tau - b) \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right| \left| \frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|, \\ \mathbb{M}_{4k}(b) &= (\tau - b) \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|^2 \left(\frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} G_2(X_{kt}) \right), \\ \mathbb{M}_{5k}(b) &= (\tau - b) \left| \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right| \left| \frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|, \\ \mathbb{M}_{6k}(b) &= (\tau - b) \left| \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|^2 \left(\frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} G_2(X_{kt}) \right), \\ \mathbb{M}_{7k}(b) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (\log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt})). \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

Note that for $1 \leq i \leq 7$ and $k \geq 1$, $\mathbb{M}_{ik}(\tau) = 0$. Let

$$\mathbb{M}_{k,n}(b) = \sum_{i=1}^7 \mathbb{M}_{ik}(b) \text{ and } \mathbb{M}_n(b) = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{M}_{k,n}(b). \quad (5.31)$$

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose (B3)-(B5), (B8), (B9) hold and $\log m(n) = o(n)$. Then, (5.27) is satisfied for the processes $\mathbb{N}_n(b)$ and $\mathbb{M}_n(b)$ defined in (5.28) and (5.31).*

Its proof is given in the Supplementary file.

Hence, by Lemma 5.6, the proof of Theorem 3.1 will be complete once we show that \mathbb{M}_n and $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n = E\mathbb{M}_n$ satisfy (5.1) and (5.2) with $d_n(b, \tau) = \sqrt{|b - \tau|} \|\theta - \eta\|_2$, $r_n = \sqrt{n}$ and $\phi_n(\delta) = \delta$.

Proof of (5.1). Note that $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) : t \leq n\tau\}$ are i.i.d. random variables with mean 0.

Also by (B4) and (B5), we have

$$\sup_k \text{Var} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{k1}) \right) = \sup_k E \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_k^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{k1}) \right) \leq C \sup_k E(G_2(X_{k1})) < \infty.$$

Therefore, $E\mathbb{M}_{1k}(b) \leq C((nb)^{-1} - (n\tau)^{-1}) \leq \frac{C}{n}(\tau - b)$. Similarly, it is easy to see that $E\mathbb{M}_{2k}(b) \leq \frac{C}{n}(\tau - b)$. Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_{3k}(b) &= (\tau - b) E \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right| \left| \frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right| \\ &\leq (\tau - b) \sqrt{E \left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^2} \sqrt{E \left(\frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using similar arguments, given for $\mathbb{M}_{1k}(b)$, we have some $C > 0$ such that

$$E \left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^2 \leq Cn^{-1}, \quad E \left(\frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^2 \leq C.$$

Therefore, $E\mathbb{M}_{3k}(b) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}}(\tau - b)$. Similarly, $E\mathbb{M}_{5k}(b) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}}(\tau - b)$.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_{4k}(b) &= (\tau - b) \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|^2 \left(\frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} G_2(X_{kt}) \right) \\ &\leq (\tau - b) \sqrt{E \left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^4} \sqrt{E \left(\frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} G_2(X_{kt}) \right)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that by (B4)-(B6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^4 \\ &= \frac{1}{(nb)^4} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{nb} E \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^4 + 6 \left(\sum_{t=1}^{nb} E \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right)^2 \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq Cn^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

and $E \left(\frac{1}{n(\tau - b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} G_2(X_{kt}) \right)^2 \leq C$. Therefore, $E\mathbb{M}_{4k}(b) \leq C(\tau - b)n^{-1}$. Similarly, $E\mathbb{M}_{6k}(b) \leq C(\tau - b)n^{-1}$. Next, consider $\mathbb{M}_{7k}(b)$. By (B4) and (B5), it is easy to see that there is $C > 0$ (independent of k) such that $E(\mathbb{M}_{7k}(b)) \leq -C(\tau - b)(\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 \quad \forall k \geq 1$.

Thus, combining $E(\mathbb{M}_{ik}(b))$ for $1 \leq i \leq 7$, we have $E(\mathbb{M}_n(b) - \mathbb{M}_n(\tau)) \leq C(\tau - b)(mn^{-1} + mn^{-1/2} - \|\theta - \eta\|_2^2)$. Hence by (SNR2), $E(\mathbb{M}_n(b) - \mathbb{M}_n(\tau)) \leq -Cd_n^2(b, \tau)$ for some $C > 0$. This completes the proof of (5.1).

Proof of (5.2). As we have argued in the proof of Theorem 2.1, it is enough to show $\text{Var}(\mathbb{M}_n(b) - \mathbb{M}_n(\tau)) \leq Cn^{-1}d_n^2(b, \tau_n)$. This is equivalent to establishing

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \text{Var}(\mathbb{M}_{ik}(b)) \leq Cn^{-1}d_n^2(b, \tau_n) \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq 7. \quad (5.32)$$

The proof of (5.32) follows along the same lines of the proof of Lemma 5.3. Hence, it is omitted.

Thus, \mathbb{M}_n satisfies (5.1) and (5.2) and, this completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

5.6 Proof of Theorem 3.2

The proof of (a) is the same as that of Theorem 2.2(a).

Proof of (b). Let $b = \tau + h(n\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2)^{-1}$. Let $h \in K$, a compact subset of \mathbb{R} . Recall $\{\mathbb{M}_{ik}(b)\}$ from (5.29)-(5.30). Note that $L_{k,n}(b) - L_{k,n}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^4 A_{ik}(b) + \mathbb{M}_{7k}(b)$ where

$$A_{1k}(b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \left(\log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_k(b)}(X_{kt}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_k(\tau)}(X_{kt}) \right), \quad (5.33)$$

$$A_{2k}(b) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=n\tau+1}^n \left(\log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\eta}_k(\tau)}(X_{kt}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\eta}_k(b)}(X_{kt}) \right),$$

$$A_{3k}(b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=n\tau+1}^{n\tau} \left(\log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\eta}_k(b)}(X_{kt}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k(\tau)}(X_{kt}) \right),$$

$$A_{4k}(b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=n\tau+1}^{n\tau} \left(\log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k(b)}(X_{kt}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\theta}_k(\tau)}(X_{kt}) \right). \quad (5.34)$$

In the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have already established that

$$\begin{aligned} nE \left| \sum_{k=1}^m A_{1k}(b) \right| &\leq Cn \sum_{k=1}^m E|\mathbb{M}_{1k}(b)| + o(1) \leq Cm|\tau - b| + o(1) \\ &= Cmn^{-1}\|\theta - \eta\|_2^{-2}|h| + o(1) = o(1), \\ nE \left| \sum_{k=1}^m A_{3k}(b) \right| &\leq Cn \sum_{k=1}^m (E|\mathbb{M}_{3k}(b)| + E|\mathbb{M}_{4k}(b)|) + o(1) \leq Cmn^{1/2}|\tau - b| + o(1) \\ &= C|h|mn^{-1/2}\|\theta - \eta\|_2^{-2} + o(1) = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $n \sum_{k=1}^m A_{1k}(b), n \sum_{k=1}^m A_{3k}(b) \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Similarly, $n \sum_{k=1}^m A_{2k}(b), n \sum_{k=1}^m A_{4k}(b) \xrightarrow{P} 0$.

Let $b_i = \tau + h_i(n\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2)^{-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $h_i \in K$. Using similar argument as above, one can establish finite dimensional convergence $(n \sum_{k=1}^m A_{jk}(b_i) : 1 \leq i \leq r) \xrightarrow{P} (0, 0, \dots, 0)$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Therefore, by tightness of $n \sum_{k=1}^m A_{jk}(b)$, we have $\sup_{h \in K} \left| n \sum_{k=1}^m A_{jk}(b) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

Let $-C < h < 0$ for some $C > 0$. Now, for some θ_k^* between θ_k and η_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} n \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{M}_{7k}(b) &= \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \sum_{k=1}^m (\log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt})) \\ &= \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \sum_{k=1}^m (\eta_k - \theta_k) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \sum_{k=1}^m (\eta_k - \theta_k)^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_k^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \sum_{k=1}^m (\eta_k - \theta_k)^3 \frac{\partial^3}{\partial \theta_k^3} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta_k = \theta_k^*} \\ &= T_1 + T_2 + T_3 \quad (\text{say}). \end{aligned}$$

By (B11), $E|T_3| \leq C\|\theta - \eta\|_2^{-2}|h|[\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^3] (\sup_{k,t} EG_3(X_{kt})) \rightarrow 0$. Thus, $T_3 \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Let B_h be the standard Brownian motion on the real line. Clearly,

$$T_2 \xrightarrow{P} -\lim \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 I(\theta_k)}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2} |h| \quad \text{and} \quad T_1 \xrightarrow{D} \sqrt{\lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 I(\theta_k)}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2}} B_h. \quad (5.35)$$

Similarly, $T_3 \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and (5.35) also hold for $0 < h < C$. This establishes one dimensional weak convergence of $n \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{M}_{7k}(b)$. Similarly one can show finite dimensional weak convergence and tightness of $n \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{M}_{7k}(b)$. This completes the proof of (b).

Proof of (c). In this case, we take $b = \tau + h/n$ and still analogously to (b), $n \sum_{k=1}^m A_{ik}(b) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. As we have seen in the proof of Theorem 2.2(c), for the term $\mathbb{M}_{7k}(b)$ we consider the partition of $\{1, 2, \dots, m(n)\}$ into the sets \mathcal{K}_n and \mathcal{K}_0 (see (2.4)). As we have discussed in Section 2, \mathcal{K}_0 is a finite set. Therefore, by (A4) and (B10), we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} (\mathbb{M}_{7k}(\tau + (h+1)/n) - \mathbb{M}_{7k}(\tau + h/n)) \Rightarrow \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} (\log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k^*}(Z_{kh}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k^*}(Z_{kh})),$$

where $Z_{kh} \stackrel{d}{=} X_{1k}^* I(h \leq 0) + X_{2k}^* I(h > 0)$. Let $-C < h < 0$ for some $C > 0$. Then for \mathcal{K}_n ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mathbb{M}_{7k}(\tau + (h+1)/n) - \mathbb{M}_{7k}(\tau + h/n)) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\eta_k - \theta_k) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) + 0.5 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\eta_k - \theta_k)^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta_k^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

Thus, if $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\eta_k - \theta_k| \rightarrow 0$, then (5.36) converges to $-0.5(\lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 I(\theta_k)) + \sqrt{(\lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 I(\theta_k))} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. A similar convergence also holds for $h > 0$. This completes the proof of (c). Hence, Theorem 3.2 is established. \square

5.7 Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this proof we shall use \tilde{X}_{kt} , $\hat{\tau}$ and \tilde{h} for $\tilde{X}_{kt, \text{LSE}}$, $\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}}$ and $\tilde{h}_{n, \text{LSE}}$ respectively. First, we shall establish the convergence rate

$$\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2 \tilde{h} = O_P(1). \quad (5.37)$$

To prove (5.37), we use the following lemma. Its proof is given in the supplement.

Lemma 5.8. *Suppose (A1) and (A8) hold. Then for some $C > 0$, $P(\sup_{i,k} \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 < C) \rightarrow 1$.*

By Lemma 5.8, to prove (5.37), it is enough to establish that

$$\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2 \tilde{h} = O_{P^*}(1) \quad (5.38)$$

where $P^*(\cdot) = P(\cdot | \sup_{i,k} \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 < C)$.

To prove (5.38), we use Lemma 5.1. Recall $\tilde{M}_n(h)$ from (4.2). We shall prove that (5.1) and (5.2) of Lemma 5.1 are satisfied for $E(\cdot) = E^*(\cdot) = E(\cdot | \sup_{i,k} \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 < C)$, $\mathbb{M}_n = \tilde{M}_n$, $\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n = E^*(\tilde{M}_n | \{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\})$, $d_n^2(a, b) = n^{-1} \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2 |a - b|$, $\phi_n(\delta) = \delta$, $\alpha = 1.5$ and $r_n = \sqrt{n}$.

Suppose $h < 0$ and $nb = n\hat{\tau} + h$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M}_n(h) - \tilde{M}_n(0) &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\sum_{t=1}^{nb} (\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})^2 + \sum_{t=nb+1}^n (\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n\hat{\tau}} (\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})^2 + \sum_{t=n\hat{\tau}+1}^n (\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} (\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})^2 - \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} (\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[-n(\hat{\tau} - b)(\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 - 2(\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k}) \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} (\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k}) \right] \\ &= A_1 + A_2, \quad (\text{say}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.39)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(h) - \tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(0) &= E^*(\tilde{M}_n(h) - \tilde{M}_n(0)|\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}) \\ &= A_1 = -(\hat{\tau} - b)\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2 = -d_n^2(h, 0),\end{aligned}\tag{5.40}$$

which implies (5.1) for $h < 0$.

To establish (5.2), note that

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} E^*((\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})^2|\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}) \\ &= \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} E((\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})^2|\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}, \sup_{i,k} \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 < C) \\ &= \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 I(\sup_{i,k} \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 < C) \\ &\leq Cn(\hat{\tau} - b)\end{aligned}\tag{5.41}$$

and for some $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}& E^* \sup_{d_n^2(h,0) \leq \delta^2} |\mathbb{M}_n(h) - \mathbb{M}_n(0) - \tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(h) - \tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(0)| \\ &= E^* \left[E^* \sup_{d_n^2(h,0) \leq \delta^2} \left(|\mathbb{M}_n(h) - \mathbb{M}_n(0) - \tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(h) - \tilde{\mathbb{M}}_n(0)| |\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}| \right) \right] \\ &= E^* \left[E^* \sup_{d_n^2(h,0) \leq \delta^2} \left(|A_1 + A_2 - A_1| |\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}| \right) \right] \\ &\leq C_1 E^* \sup_{d_n^2(h,0) = \delta^2} E^*(|A_2| |\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}|) \\ &\leq C_1 E^* \sup_{d_n^2(h,0) = \delta^2} (E^*(|A_2|^2 |\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}|))^{1/2} \\ &\leq C_2 E^* \left[\sup_{d_n^2(h,0) = \delta^2} \left(\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[(\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} E^*((\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})^2 |\{X_{kt} : k, t \geq 1\}) \right] \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq C_3 n^{-1/2} E^* \sup_{d_n^2(h,0) = \delta^2} \left[(\hat{\tau} - b) \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq C_4 n^{-1/2} \delta.\end{aligned}\tag{5.42}$$

This proves (5.2) for $h < 0$. Similar argument proves (5.1) and (5.2) for $h > 0$.

Thus (5.38) and consequently (5.37) are proved.

Note that (5.37) implies Theorem 4.1(a).

To prove Theorem 4.1(b), we use the following lemma. Its proof is given in the supplement.

Lemma 5.9. Suppose (A1), (A8) and (SNR3) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Then for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$, the following statements hold.

$$(a) P(\sup_{k,t} E((\tilde{X}_{kt} - E(\tilde{X}_{kt}|\{X_{kt}\}))^4|\{X_{kt}\}) < C_1) \rightarrow 1, P(\inf_{k,i} \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 > C_2) \rightarrow 1.$$

$$(b) \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2 \xrightarrow{P} \gamma_{L, LSE}^2.$$

$$(c) \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{2k}^2 \xrightarrow{P} \gamma_{R, LSE}^2.$$

Now, let $P^{**}(\cdot) = P(\cdot | \sup_{k,t} E((\tilde{X}_{kt} - E(\tilde{X}_{kt}|\{X_{kt}\}))^4|\{X_{kt}\}) < C_1, \inf_{k,i} \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 > C_2)$. Similarly define E^{**} and Var^{**} . By Lemma 5.9, it is easy to see that the convergences in Lemma 5.9(b) and (c) hold for P^{**} also. When $\sup_{k,t} E(\tilde{X}_{kt} - E(\tilde{X}_{kt}|\{X_{kt}\}))^4|\{X_{kt}\}) < C_1$, $\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2$ is bounded for each $i = 1, 2$. Therefore, the convergences in Lemma 5.9(b) and (c) also hold in E^{**} .

To prove Theorem 4.1(b), by Lemma 5.9(a), it is enough to establish that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P^{**}(n\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2 \tilde{h} \leq x) \\ & \rightarrow P(\arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + \gamma_{L, LSE} B_h I(h \leq 0) + \gamma_{R, LSE} B_h I(h > 0)) \leq x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

Let $b = \hat{\tau} + h/n\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2$. Note that,

$$n(\tilde{M}_n(\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2} h) - \tilde{M}_n(0)) = \begin{cases} -|h| - 2 \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})(\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k}), & \text{if } h < 0 \\ -|h| - 2 \sum_{t=n\hat{\tau}+1}^{nb} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})(\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{2k}), & \text{if } h > 0. \end{cases}$$

First consider the case $h < 0$. Note that $\{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})(\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})\}$ is a collection of independent random variables. By Lemma 5.9(b), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E^{**} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})(\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k}) &= E^{**} \left[\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k}) E^{**}((\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k})|\{X_{kt}\}) \right] = 0, \\ \text{Var}^{**} \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})(\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k}) \right) &= h E^{**} \left(\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2 \right) \rightarrow h \gamma_{L, LSE}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{E^{**} \left[\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})(\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k}) \right]^3}{\left[\text{Var}^{**} \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\hat{\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})(\tilde{X}_{kt} - \hat{\mu}_{1k}) \right) \right]^{3/2}} \leq CE \left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^m |\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k}|^3}{\sum_{k=1}^m |\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k}|^2} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C(E\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2)^{1/2} \leq C(E\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \mu_1\|_2^2 + E\|\hat{\mu}_2 - \mu_2\|_2^2 + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2) \\
&\leq C(mn^{-1} + \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2) \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.44}$$

Hence by Lyapunov's central limit theorem, under (A1), (A2), (A3), (A8), (SNR3),

$$n(\tilde{M}_n(\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}h) - \tilde{M}(0)) \Rightarrow -|h| + \gamma_{\text{L,LSE}} B_h \tag{5.45}$$

for $-C < h < 0$ and where B_h is the standard Brownian motion.

Similarly, when $0 < h < C$, by (A1), (A2), (A3), (A8), (SNR3) and Lemma 5.9(b),

$$n(\tilde{M}_n(\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}h) - \tilde{M}(0)) \Rightarrow -|h| + \gamma_{\text{R,LSE}} B_h. \tag{5.46}$$

(5.45) and (5.46) in conjunction with Lemma 5.4 establish Theorem 4.1(b).

A similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 2.2(c) and similar approximations as in the proof of Theorem 4.1(b) also work for Theorem 4.1(c) and hence we omit them. Hence, Theorem 4.1 is established. \square

References

- T. Amemiya. Regression analysis when the dependent variable is truncated normal. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 997–1016, 1973.
- J. Bai. Common breaks in means and variances for panel data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 157(1):78–92, 2010.
- B. H. Baltagi, Q. Feng, and C. Kao. Estimation of heterogeneous panels with structural breaks. *Journal of Econometrics*, 191(1):176–195, 2016.
- M. Basseville and I. V. Nikiforov. *Detection of Abrupt Changes: Theory and Application*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1993. ISBN 0-13-126780-9.
- M. Bhattacharjee, A. Bose, and R. Srivastava. A white noise test under weak conditions. *Submitted for publication*, 2017.
- P. Bhattacharya. Some aspects of change-point analysis. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, pages 28–56, 1994.

- P. J. Brockwell and R. A. Davis. *Time series: theory and methods*. Springer, 2009.
- A. C. Cameron, P. K. Trivedi, et al. Count panel data. *Oxford Handbook of Panel Data Econometrics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), forthcoming*, 2013.
- J. Chen and A. K. Gupta. *Parametric statistical change point analysis: with applications to genetics, medicine, and finance*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- M. Csörgö and L. Horváth. *Limit theorems in change-point analysis*. John Wiley & Sons Inc, 1997.
- M. Frisé. *Financial surveillance*, volume 71. John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- L. Horváth and M. Hušková. Change-point detection in panel data. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 33(4):631–648, 2012.
- C. Hsiao. *Analysis of panel data*. Number 54. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- D. Kim. Common breaks in time trends for large panel data with a factor structure. *The Econometrics Journal*, 17(3):301–337, 2014.
- L. Koepcke, G. Ashida, and J. Kretzberg. Single and multiple change point detection in spike trains: Comparison of different cusum methods. *Frontiers in systems neuroscience*, 10, 2016.
- M. R. Kosorok. *Introduction to Empirical Processes and Semiparametric Inference*. Springer, 2008.
- E. L. Lehmann and G. Casella. *Theory of point estimation*, 2nd edition. Springer, 1998.
- D. Li, J. Qian, and L. Su. Panel data models with interactive fixed effects and multiple structural breaks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(516):1804–1819, 2016. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2015.1119696.
- S. Liangjun and J. Qian. Shrinkage Estimation of Common Breaks in Panel Data Models via Adaptive Group Fused Lasso. Working Papers 07-2015, Singapore Management University, School of Economics, Sept. 2015. URL <https://ideas.repec.org/p/siu/wpaper/07-2015.html>.
- J. H. Park. Changepoint analysis of binary and ordinal probit models: An application to bank rate policy under the interwar gold standard. *Political Analysis*, 19(2):188–204, 2011.

P. Qiu. *Introduction to statistical process control*. CRC Press, 2013.

A. W. van der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*. Springer, 1996.

X. Wu and Y. Yang. Change-point estimates in longitudinal binary data. *Tsinghua Science & Technology*, 13(4):553–559, 2008.

N. R. Zhang, D. O. Siegmund, H. Ji, and J. Z. Li. Detecting simultaneous changepoints in multiple sequences. *Biometrika*, pages 631–645, 2010.

6 Supplementary Material

6.1 Supplement to Section 2.1

The following examples provide some situations where the limits in $\gamma_{L,LSE}$, $\gamma_{R,LSE}$, c_1 , $\gamma_{L,LSE}^*$ and $\gamma_{R,LSE}^*$ do not exist.

Example 6.1 shows that the limits can not exist if $\sigma_{ik}^2(n)$ oscillates over n .

Example 6.1. Suppose $\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = 2 + (-1)^n$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$. Further suppose $c_1^2 = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2$ exists. Then

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{2k}^2}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} = 2 + (-1)^n \text{ and}$$

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{2k}^2 = (2 + (-1)^n) \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2,$$

which do not have a limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Moreover, by (A1) and (A3), $\{\sigma_{ik}^2(n)\}$ is a bounded sequence for each k and i . Thus for each $k \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$, $\{\sigma_{ik}^2(n)\}$ needs to converge to a limit σ_{ik}^{*2} (say). This leads to

$$(a) \sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\sigma_{ik}^2(n) - \sigma_{ik}^{*2}| \rightarrow 0 \text{ for all } i = 1, 2 \text{ and for some } \sigma_{ik}^* > 0,$$

in Propositions 2.3 and 2.4.

In the next two examples, we deal with Regime (c): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| \rightarrow c^2 > 0$ and the existence of the limits in c_1 , $\gamma_{L,LSE}^*$ and $\gamma_{R,LSE}^*$. Consider the following conditions which are considered in Proposition 2.4. For some $\mu_{ik}^* \in \mathbb{R}$, which are free of n ,

(f) $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{ik}(n) - \mu_{ik}^*| = O(m(n)^{-1/2})$ for all $i = 1, 2$ and

(g) $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)| = o(\sqrt{m(n)})$.

Example 6.2 provides a situation where (a) and (f) are satisfied but (g) does not hold and shows that the limits in c_1 , $\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^*$ and $\gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^*$ do not exist.

Example 6.2. Suppose $\sigma_{ik}^2(n) = \sigma^2$ for all $k, n \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2$. Let for all $k \in \mathcal{K}_n$ and i ,

$$\mu_{ik}(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m(n)}}(2i + \frac{1}{k}), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{m(n)}}(3i + \frac{1}{k}), & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

Note that this example satisfies (a) and (f) but not (g).

Now,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{ik}^2(n) = \begin{cases} 2\sigma^2 \left(\frac{\text{cardinality of } \mathcal{K}_n}{m(n)} \right), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ 3\sigma^2 \left(\frac{\text{cardinality of } \mathcal{K}_n}{m(n)} \right), & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

It is easy to see that $\left(\frac{\text{cardinality of } \mathcal{K}_n}{m(n)} \right) \rightarrow 1$. Hence c_1^2 , $\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^{*2}$ and $\gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^{*2}$ do not exist.

Similar phenomenon happens for regime (b): $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ once we replace $m(n)$ in (f), (g) and Example 6.2 by $m(n)\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}$ and then $\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^2$ and $\gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^2$ do not exist.

6.1.1 Proof of Proposition 2.3

We have that $\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^2 \rightarrow 0$ and $nm^{-1}\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^2 \rightarrow \infty$. Recall

$$\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^2 = \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2(n)}{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^2}, \quad \gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^2 = \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{2k}^2(n)}{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^2}.$$

By (a), it is easy to see that

$$\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^2 = \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^2}, \quad \gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^2 = \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{2k}^2}{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^2}.$$

Moreover, by (A1) and (A3), $\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2$ and $\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{2k}^2$ are all bounded quantities. Therefore, their limit exists if they are Cauchy sequences. We shall show that $\{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2\}$

is indeed a Cauchy sequence.

Note that all the inequalities below hold for large enough n . The difference between two consecutive terms in $\{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2\}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m(n+1)} (\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^2} - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^2} \right| \\
& \leq C \|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^{-2} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{m(n+1)} (\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right| \\
& = C \|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^{-2} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{m(n+1)} (\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right| \\
& \quad + C \|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^{-2} \left| \sum_{k=m(n)+1}^{m(n+1)} (\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right| \\
& \leq C \|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} \left[|\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n) + \mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1)| \right. \\
& \quad \left. |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n) - \mu_{1k}(n+1) + \mu_{2k}(n+1)| \right] \\
& \quad + C \left| \frac{m(n+1) - m(n)}{m(n+1)} \right| \frac{m(n+1)}{\|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^2} \sup_k |\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1)|^2 \\
& \leq C \sup_k (|\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{1k}(n)| + |\mu_{2k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n)|) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)|}{\|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^2} \\
& \quad + C \sup_k (|\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{1k}(n)| + |\mu_{2k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n)|) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)|}{\|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^2} \\
& \quad + C \left| \frac{m(n+1) - m(n)}{m(n+1)} \right| \frac{m(n+1)}{\|\mu_1(n+1) - \mu_2(n+1)\|_2^2} \sup_k |\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1)|^2 \\
& = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows $\{\|\mu_1(n) - \mu_2(n)\|_2^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2\}$ is Cauchy. Similar arguments establish the result for the other sequences. \square

6.1.2 Proof of Proposition 2.4

We have that $\sum_{k=1}^{m(n)} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \rightarrow c^2 > 0$ and $m(n) = o(n)$. Recall

$$\begin{aligned} c_1^2 &= \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2, \quad \gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^{*2} = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2(n), \\ \gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^{*2} &= \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{2k}^2(n). \end{aligned}$$

By (a), it is easy to see that

$$\gamma_{\text{L,LSE}}^{*2} = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2, \quad \gamma_{\text{R,LSE}}^{*2} = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{2k}^2.$$

Moreover, by (A1) and (A3), $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2$, $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2$ and $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{2k}^2$ are all bounded quantities. Therefore, their limit exist if they are Cauchy sequences.

The difference between two consecutive terms in $\{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2\}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{n+1}} (\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{n+1} \cap \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{n+1} \cap \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{n+1} - \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right| + \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n - \mathcal{K}_{n+1}} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2 \right| \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{n+1} \cap \mathcal{K}_n} \left[|\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n) + \mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1)| \right. \\ & \quad \left. |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n) - \mu_{1k}(n+1) + \mu_{2k}(n+1)| \right] \\ & \quad + C \left| \frac{m(n+1) - m(n)}{m(n+1)} \right| m(n+1) \sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{n+1}} |\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1)|^2 \\ & \quad + C \left| \frac{m(n+1) - m(n)}{m(n)} \right| m(n) \sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)|^2 \\ &\leq \sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n \cap \mathcal{K}_{n+1}} (|\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{1k}(n)| + |\mu_{2k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n)|) \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)| \\ & \quad + \sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n \cap \mathcal{K}_{n+1}} (|\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{1k}(n)| + |\mu_{2k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n)|) \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{n+1}} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)| \\ & \quad + C \left| \frac{m(n+1) - m(n)}{m(n+1)} \right| m(n+1) \sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_{n+1}} |\mu_{1k}(n+1) - \mu_{2k}(n+1)|^2 \\ & \quad + C \left| \frac{m(n+1) - m(n)}{m(n)} \right| m(n) \sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

$= o(1)$.

This establishes that $\{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k}(n) - \mu_{2k}(n))^2 \sigma_{1k}^2\}$ is Cauchy. Similarly one can establish the result for the other sequences. \square

6.2 Supplement to Section 2.3

The following two examples discuss asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$ for two m -dependent white noise processes. Suppose (SNR1) holds for these examples.

Example 6.3. IID process. Suppose $\{\varepsilon_{kt}\}$ are independent and identically distributed over t and independent over k with mean 0, variance $\sigma_{k\varepsilon}^2$, $\sup_k E\varepsilon_{kt}^r < \infty$ for all $r \geq 1$ and $\inf_k \sigma_{k\varepsilon} > C$ for some $C > 0$. Note that $\{\varepsilon_{kt}\}$ is a 0-dependent white noise process. Suppose for each $k, t \geq 1$,

$$X_{kt} = \mu_{1k}I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mu_{2k}I(t > n\tau_n) + \varepsilon_{kt}. \quad (6.3)$$

Then (D1), (D2), (D3) are satisfied and hence the conclusions of Theorem 2.5 and 2.6(a) hold for (6.3). Moreover (D4) holds if (b)-(e) in Proposition 2.3 are satisfied. Therefore, conclusion of Theorem 2.6(b) holds for (6.3) under (b)-(e) in Proposition 2.3. Also (D6) holds if (e)-(g) in Proposition 2.4 hold. Thus, under (A4), (D5) and (e)-(g) in Proposition 2.4, the conclusion of Theorem 2.6(c) hold for (6.3).

Example 6.4. Uncorrelated non-linear moving average process. Suppose $\{\varepsilon_{kt}\}$ is as in Example 6.3. Suppose for all $k, t \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{kt} &= \mu_{1k}I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mu_{2k}I(t > n\tau_n) + Y_{kt}, \quad \text{where} \\ Y_{kt} &= \varepsilon_{k(t-1)}\varepsilon_{k(t-2)} + \varepsilon_{kt}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

Note that for each $k \geq 1$, $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, in this example, is a 3-dependent white noise process. Here (D1), (D2) and (D3) are satisfied. Note that $\text{Var}(X_{kt}) = \sigma_{k\varepsilon}^4$. Therefore, (D4) holds if (b)-(e) in Proposition 2.3 are satisfied. Moreover (e)-(g) in Proposition 2.4 imply (A7) and (D6). Then the results given in Example 6.3 also hold for (6.4).

As discussed after Example 2.4, $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ in (D1) may not be always an m -dependent or a Gaussian process. Then (D3) may not be satisfied always even if $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is moment

stationary process. The following remark provides a wide class of processes for which (D3) holds.

Often dependence in time series is captured by its mixing properties. There are several notions of mixing in the literature such as α , β , ϕ and ρ -mixing, with α -mixing is strongest among them.

Definition: A process $\{Y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is called an α -mixing process if as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\alpha(n) = \sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{A}_1^m \\ B \in \mathcal{A}_{m+n}^\infty}} |P(A \cap B) - P(A)P(B)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{where} \quad (6.5)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_1^m = \sigma\text{-algebra generated by } Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m, \quad (6.6)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{m+n}^\infty = \sigma\text{-algebra generated by } Y_{m+n}, Y_{m+n+1}, \dots \quad (6.7)$$

$\alpha(n)$ in (6.5) is called mixing coefficient of $\{Y_t\}$.

The following lemma from [Bhattacharjee et al. \(2017\)](#) provides sufficient condition on a process $\{Y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ so that its cumulants are summable.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose $\{Y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is an uniformly bounded centered moment stationary α -mixing process with mixing coefficient $\alpha(n) = \alpha^n$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then for all $t, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \geq 1$,*

$$|Cum(Y_t, Y_{t_1+t}, Y_{t_2+t}, \dots, Y_{t_r+t})| < C\alpha^{(|t_1|+|t_2|+\dots+|t_r|)/r}.$$

The following remark is immediate from Lemma 6.1.

Remark 6.1. *Consider $\{X_{kt}\}$ as in (D1). Suppose $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}, k \geq 1\}$ are uniformly bounded and for each k , $\{Y_{kt} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is centered moment stationary α -mixing process with mixing-coefficient $\alpha_k(n) = \alpha_k^n$ and there is $c > 0$ such that $0 < \sup_k \alpha_k < 1 - c$. Then $\{X_{kt}\}$ satisfies Assumption (D3).*

6.2.1 Proof of Theorem 2.5

This proof will be complete using similar techniques as in Section 5.1 once we establish Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 under (D1), (D2) and (SNR1).

Note that there is $C > 0$ (independent of k) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
E(N_{1k}^2(b)) &= E \left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{(nb)^2} \sum_{t,t'=1}^{nb} \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \leq \frac{C}{n}, \\
E(N_{2k}^2(b)) &= E \left(\frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{(n(1-b))^2} \sum_{t,t'=nb+1}^n \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \leq \frac{C}{n}, \\
E(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) &= E \left(\frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{(n(\tau-b))^2} \sum_{t,t'=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \leq \frac{C}{n(\tau-b)}, \\
E(N_{1k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &= \frac{1}{n\tau} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} E \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right) \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n\tau} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} \sum_{t'=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \leq \frac{C}{n}, \\
E(N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &= \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} E \left[\left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^n (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right) \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \sum_{t'=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \leq \frac{C}{n}, \\
E(N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &= \frac{1}{nb} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} E \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^{nb} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right) \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{nb} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \sum_{t'=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \leq \frac{C}{n}, \\
E(N_{2k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &= \frac{1}{n(1-\tau)} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} E \left[\left(\sum_{t=n\tau+1}^n (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right) \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n(1-\tau)} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=n\tau+1}^n \sum_{t'=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \leq \frac{C}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{k,b} E(N_{1k}^2(b)) &\leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{2k}^2(b)) \leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_k E(N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-1}, \\
\sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{1k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &\leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq Cn^{-1}, \\
\sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &\leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{2k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq Cn^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since N_{4k} is non-random, $E(N_{4k}^2) = N_{4k}^2$. Finally, since $E(N_{1k}(b)) = E(N_{2k}(b)) = E(N_{3k}(b, \tau)) = 0$ for all b , we have

$$\sup_{k,b} E(N_{1k}(b)N_{4k}) = 0, \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{2k}(b)N_{4k}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{3k}(b, \tau)N_{4k}) = 0.$$

Hence, Lemma 5.2 is established under (D1), (D2) and (SNR1).

Note that by (A1) and for some $C > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(N_{1k}^2(b)) &= E(N_{1k}^4(b)) - (E(N_{1k}^2(b)))^2 \\ &= E\left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)^4 - \left(E\left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(nb)^4} \sum_{\substack{t_1, t_2, \\ t_3, t_4=1}}^{nb} \left[\text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2}, X_{kt_3}, X_{kt_4}) + \text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2})\text{Cum}(X_{kt_3}, X_{kt_4}) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(nb)^4} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{nb} \sum_{t'=1}^{nb} \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \right)^2 \\ &\leq Cn^{-3} + Cn^{-2} \leq Cn^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sup_{k,b} \text{Var}(N_{1k}^2(b)) \leq Cn^{-2}$. Similarly, $\sup_{k,b} \text{Var}(N_{2k}^2(b)) \leq Cn^{-2}$.

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) &= E(N_{3k}^4(b, \tau)) - (E(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)))^2 \\ &= E\left(\frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)^4 - \left(\frac{1}{(n(\tau-b))^2} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Var}(X_{kt})\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(n(\tau-b))^4} \sum_{\substack{t_1, t_2, \\ t_3, t_4=nb+1}}^{n\tau} \left[\text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2}, X_{kt_3}, X_{kt_4}) + \text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2})\text{Cum}(X_{kt_3}, X_{kt_4}) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(n(\tau-b))^4} \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \sum_{t'=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Cum}(X_{kt}, X_{kt'}) \right)^2 \\ &\leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-3} + C(n(\tau-b))^{-2} \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-2}$. Similarly, $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-2}$ and $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-2}$. Moreover, since N_{4k} is non-random,

$\text{Var}(N_{4k}^2) = 0$. Also by Lemma 5.2, we get

$$\text{Var}(N_{4k}N_{3k}(b, \tau)) = N_{4k}^2 E(N_{3k}(b, \tau))^2 \leq CN_{4k}^2(n(\tau - b))^{-1}.$$

Therefore, $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{4k}N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq CN_{4k}^2(n(\tau - b))^{-1}$. Similarly, $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{4k}N_{2k}(b, \tau)) \leq CN_{4k}^2n^{-1}$.

This completes the of proof Lemma 5.3 under (D1), (D2) and (SNR1), and hence the results in Theorem 2.5 are established. \square

6.3 Supplement to Section 3

In this section, we present in detail certain examples that were omitted for space considerations from Section 3.

Example 6.5. Exponential family. Consider the model in (3.15) as presented in Example 3.1. As mentioned in Section 2, (A1) implies $\sup_{k,n,t} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) < \infty$. Here, it reduces to

$$(\tilde{B}_1): \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta''(\lambda) < \infty.$$

Further, Assumption (A3) is equivalent to

$$(\tilde{B}_2): \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \beta''(\lambda) > \epsilon \quad \text{for some } \epsilon > 0.$$

Therefore, all the results stated in Section 2 continue to hold if we assume (A1), (A2) and \tilde{B}_2 (instead of (A3)), (A4)-(A7) and (SNR1) with $\mu_{1k} = \beta'(\theta_k)$, $\sigma_{1k}^2 = \beta''(\theta_k)$ and $\mu_{2k} = \beta'(\eta_k)$, $\sigma_{2k}^2 = \beta''(\eta_k)$ for all $k \geq 1$.

As has been previously mentioned, stronger assumptions are needed for the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$ compared to its least squares counterpart. Note that Assumptions (B1)-(B5), (B8) and (B9) are automatically satisfied by the one parameter natural exponential family defined in (3.14). Moreover, by (\tilde{B}_1) and (\tilde{B}_2) , we have $G_2(x) = C$ for some $C > 0$. Therefore, we only need to assume (B7), which is equivalent to (A1). As we have seen in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, some times we further require $\log m = o(n)$, which is a stronger assumption compared to those posited in Section 2.

Remark 6.2. Suppose for each $k, t \geq 1$, X_{kt} are generated by a Gaussian distribution with unknown mean $\theta_k I(t \leq \tau_n) + \eta_k I(t > \tau_n)$ and known variance $\sigma_{1k}^2 I(t \leq \tau_n) + \sigma_{2k}^2 I(t > \tau_n)$. Then, by Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we do not need the stronger assumption $\log m(n) = o(n)$.

Next, we present asymptotic properties of the maximum likelihood estimator of the change point τ_n . Recall $\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b)$ and $\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b)$ from (2.1). We can estimate θ_k and η_k respectively by $\hat{\theta}_k(b)$ and $\hat{\eta}_k(b)$, where

$$\hat{\theta}_k(b) = \arg \max_{\lambda} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \log f_{\lambda}(x_{kt}) = \arg \max_{\lambda} b(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b)\lambda + \beta(\lambda)) \quad \text{and} \quad (6.8)$$

$$\hat{\eta}_k(b) = \arg \max_{\lambda} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \log f_{\lambda}(x_{kt}) = \arg \max_{\lambda} (1-b)(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b)\lambda + \beta(\lambda)). \quad (6.9)$$

Hence, it is easy to obtain $\hat{\theta}_k(b) = \beta'^{-1}(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b)) = \alpha(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b))$ and $\hat{\eta}_k(b) = \alpha(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b))$.

The maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$ of τ_n is obtained as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} &= \arg \max_{b \in (c^*, 1-c^*)} \sum_{k=1}^m L_{k,n}(b) \quad \text{where,} \\ L_{k,n}(b) &= \frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{nb} \log f_{\hat{\theta}_k(b)}(x_{kt}) + \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \log f_{\hat{\eta}_k(b)}(x_{kt}) \right] \\ &= b[\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b)\alpha(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b)) + \beta(\alpha(\hat{\mu}_{1k}(b)))] + (1-b)[\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b)\alpha(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b)) + \beta(\alpha(\hat{\mu}_{2k}(b)))]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

The following result provides the corresponding rate of convergence and its proof follows as a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that (\tilde{B}_1) , (\tilde{B}_2) , $(B7)$, (SNR2) hold and $\log m(n) = o(n)$. Then,*

$$n\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n) = O_P(1). \quad (6.11)$$

Further, suppose $\beta(x) = Cx^2$ for some $C > 0$; i.e., $f_{\lambda}(x) = (\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^{-1}e^{-0.5\sigma^{-2}(x-\lambda)^2}$ for some known $\sigma > 0$, then (6.11) continues to hold under the weaker assumption (SNR1) .

Note that Assumptions (A1) and (B7) are equivalent. Therefore, for the Gaussian likelihood function, we do not require any stronger assumptions than those used in Theorem 2.1. Moreover, as previously discussed, (A1) or (B7) implies (\tilde{B}_1) . However, assumptions (\tilde{B}_2) , (SNR2) and $\log m(n) = o(n)$ are additionally required for other distributions members of the one parameter exponential family to establish results for $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$ vis-a-vis those for $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}$.

For establishing the asymptotic distribution of $n\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n)$, note that under the assumptions given in Theorem 6.1, it becomes degenerate at 0, if $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$. Analogously to the results given in Section 2, additional assumptions are needed for the cases when $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$

or $c > 0$.

Recall the set \mathcal{K}_n in (2.4). Let,

$$\gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}^2 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 (\beta''(\theta_k))}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}^{*2} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 (\beta''(\theta_k)).$$

Note that (\tilde{B}_2) implies $\gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}} > 0$. Moreover, $\gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}^* > 0$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 > 0$. Existence of $\gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}$ and $\gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}^*$ are required respectively for $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and $c > 0$. Moreover, this is guaranteed by the conditions in Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 when μ_{1k} , μ_{2k} , σ_{1k}^2 and σ_{2k}^2 are respectively replaced by θ_k , η_k , $\beta''(\theta_k)$ and $\beta''(\eta_k)$.

Further, (B11) reduces to the following assumption.

(\tilde{B}_3) $\beta(\cdot)$ has bounded third derivative.

For the Gaussian likelihood, (\tilde{B}_3) is always true, since $\beta(\cdot)$ is a quadratic function.

The following Theorem describes the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$, which follows from Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose (\tilde{B}_1) , (\tilde{B}_2) , (B7) and (SNR2) hold. Then, the following statements are true.*

(a) *If $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ and $\log m(n) = o(n)$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} = \tau_n) = 1$.*

(b) *If $\gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}$ exists, (\tilde{B}_3) holds and $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} n\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n) &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5\gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}^2 |h| + \gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}} B_h) \\ &= \gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}^{-2} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h), \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

where B_h denotes the standard Brownian motion.

(c) *If $\gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}^*$ exists, (\tilde{B}_3) , (A4) and (B10) hold, $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\theta_k - \eta_k| \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, then*

$$n(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (D_2(h) + C_2(h) + A_2(h))$$

where for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$D_2(h+1) - D_2(h) = -0.5 \text{Sign}(h) \gamma_{\text{MLE, EXP}}^{*2}, \quad (6.13)$$

$$C_2(h+1) - C_2(h) = \gamma_{MLE, EXP}^* W_h, \quad W_h \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (6.14)$$

$$A_2(h+1) - A_2(h) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} \left[Z_{kh}(\eta_k^* - \theta_k^*) - (\beta(\eta_k^*) - \beta(\theta_k^*)) \right], \quad (6.15)$$

and $\{Z_{kh}\}$ are independently distributed with $Z_{kh} \stackrel{d}{=} X_{1k}^* I(h \leq 0) + X_{2k}^* I(h > 0)$.

Further, suppose $\beta(x) = Cx^2$ for some $C > 0$ i.e., $f_\lambda(x) = (\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma)^{-1} e^{-0.5\sigma^{-2}(x-\lambda)^2}$ for some known $\sigma > 0$, then the asymptotic distributions in (a)-(c) continue to hold under the weaker assumption (SNR1).

In the ensuing discussion from Theorem 6.1, for the Gaussian likelihood there is no requirement for stronger assumptions compared to those in Theorem 2.2. For other likelihoods, we additionally require assumptions (\tilde{B}_2) , (SNR2) and $\log m(n) = o(n)$ for the cases of $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$ and (\tilde{B}_3) , and (SNR2) when $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ or $c > 0$.

The following comments provide additional insights.

(I) Suppose for each $k, t \geq 1$, X_{kt} are generated from a Gaussian distribution with unknown mean $\theta_k I(t \leq \tau_n) + \eta_k I(t > \tau_n)$ and known variance σ^2 . Then, $\hat{\tau}_{n, \text{LSE}} = \hat{\tau}_{n, \text{MLE}}$.

(II) Suppose for each $k \geq 1$, $E(X_{kt}) = \mu_{1k} I(t \leq \tau_n) + \mu_{2k} I(t > \tau_n)$. If $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\gamma_{MLE, EXP}^2 = \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 (\beta''(\theta_k))^{-1}}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2}. \quad (6.16)$$

Also if $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$ and $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\theta_k - \eta_k| \rightarrow 0$, then

$$\gamma_{MLE, EXP}^{*2} = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 (\beta''(\theta_k))^{-1}. \quad (6.17)$$

Proof. Note that for all $k \geq 1$, we have $\mu_{1k} = \beta'(\theta_k)$, $\mu_{2k} = \beta'(\eta_k)$. Therefore $\theta_k = \alpha(\mu_{1k})$ and $\eta_k = \alpha(\mu_{2k})$ where $\alpha = \beta'^{-1}$. By (\tilde{B}_1) and applying the mean value theorem,

$$|\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}| = |\beta'(\theta_k) - \beta'(\eta_k)| \leq C |\theta_k - \eta_k|. \quad (6.18)$$

Thus $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ implies $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{MLE, EXP}^2 &= \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k - \eta_k)^2 (\beta''(\theta_k))}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2} \\ &= \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\alpha(\mu_{1k}) - \alpha(\mu_{2k}))^2 (\beta''(\theta_k))}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 (\beta''(\theta_k))^{-2} (\beta''(\theta_k))}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2} \\
&= \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 (\beta''(\theta_k))^{-1}}{\|\theta - \eta\|_2^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

The completes the proof of (6.16). Similar arguments work for (6.17). \square

(III) It is immediate from (II) that Theorem 6.2 continues to hold if we replace $\|\theta - \eta\|_2$, $|\theta_k - \eta_k|$ and $\gamma_{MLE, EXP}^2$ respectively by $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2$, $|\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k}|$ and

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{MLE, EXP}^2 = \lim \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 (\beta''(\theta_k))^{-1}}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2}. \tag{6.20}$$

(IV) Recall $\{\mu_{ik}\}$, γ_{LSE} and $\tilde{\gamma}_{MLE, EXP}$ respectively from (II), (2.19) and (6.20). Suppose (A1) (equivalently (B7)), (\tilde{B}_1) , (\tilde{B}_2) (equivalently (A3)), (\tilde{B}_3) and (SNR2) hold, γ_{LSE} and $\tilde{\gamma}_{MLE, EXP}$ exist and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Then, by Remark 2.2, Theorem 6.2(b) and (III),

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)) &= \gamma_{LSE}^4 \text{Var}(\arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h)) \\
\text{Var}(n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE} - \tau_n)) &= \tilde{\gamma}_{MLE, EXP}^{-4} \text{Var}(\arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h)).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that γ_{LSE}^2 and $\tilde{\gamma}_{MLE, EXP}^{-2}$ are respectively weighted arithmetic and harmonic means of $\{\sigma_{1k}^2\}$. Therefore, the variance of $n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE} - \tau_n)$ is smaller than that of $n\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)$.

(V) Suppose $\|\theta - \eta\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Recall the partition of $\{1, 2, \dots, m(n)\}$ into \mathcal{K}_n and \mathcal{K}_n^c given in (2.4). Suppose \mathcal{K}_n^c is the empty set. Then, under the assumptions of Theorem 6.2(c),

$$n(\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE} - \tau_n) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \gamma_{MLE, EXP}^{*-2} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h). \tag{6.21}$$

Then, by (6.21), Remark 2.3 and using similar arguments given in (IV), we obtain that the variance of $n(\hat{\tau}_{n,MLE} - \tau_n)$ is smaller than that of $n(\hat{\tau}_{n,LSE} - \tau_n)$.

Example 6.6. Bernoulli data, continuation of Example 2.1. Suppose the data $\{X_{kt}\}$ are generated from model (2.22). As discussed in Example 2.1, (B6) is satisfied for this model. It is easy to see that (2.23) implies (\tilde{B}_1) and (\tilde{B}_2) . Therefore, if (2.23) and (SNR2) hold and $\log m(n) = o(n)$, then the conclusions of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2(a) continue to hold. Observe that in this case, we require strong assumptions (2.23), (SNR2) and $\log m(n) = o(n)$ compared

to those used in Example 2.1 when $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$.

Further, (2.23) implies (\tilde{B}_3) . Suppose (b)-(e) in Proposition 2.3 hold after replacing μ by p . Then, under (2.23) and (SNR2), the conclusions of Theorem 6.2(b) continue to hold for the model (2.22).

Suppose (e)-(g) in Propositions 2.4 hold after replacing μ by p . Then, under (2.23), (2.24), (A4) and (SNR2), the conclusions of Theorem 6.2(c) holds for the model (2.22).

Note that (SNR2) is the only assumption that we additionally need compared to those used in Example 2.1 when $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ or $c^2 > 0$.

Example 6.7. Poisson data, continuation of Example 2.2. Suppose $\{X_{kt}\}$ are generated from model (2.25). (B6) is satisfied for this model if last inequality of (2.26) holds. Moreover, (2.26) implies (\tilde{B}_1) and (\tilde{B}_2) . Therefore, if (2.26) and (SNR2) hold and $\log m(n) = o(n)$, then the conclusions of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2(a) continue to hold.

Also (2.26) implies (β_3) . Suppose (b)-(e) in Proposition 2.3 hold with μ replaced by λ . Then, under (2.26) and (SNR2), the conclusions of Theorem 6.2(b) hold for model (2.25).

Suppose (e)-(g) in Proposition 2.4 hold with μ replaced by λ . Then, under (2.26), (2.24) with p replaced by λ , (A4) and (SNR2), the conclusions of Theorem 2.2(c) hold for the model in (2.25).

Again we observe the need for stronger assumptions than the least squares counterpart.

Example 6.8. Normal data, continuation of Example 2.3. Suppose $\{X_{kt}\}$ are generated from model (2.28). Then, by Theorems 6.1 and 6.2, all results in Example 2.3 continue to hold for the estimator $\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}}$.

Example 6.9. (A curved exponential distribution.) Let Λ be a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R} , such that $\inf_{x \in \Lambda} |x| > C > 0$. Consider the family of $\mathcal{N}(\lambda, \lambda^2)$ distributions, where $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Note that this family satisfies (B1)-(B3). Further, define $\delta = \lambda^{-1}$. As Λ is bounded away from 0 and ∞ , it is equivalent to working with δ , instead of λ . For a given observation $X = x$, the log-likelihood of δ is given by $L(\delta) = \log \delta - 0.5(x^2 \delta^2 + 1 - 2x\delta)$. Thus (B4) holds and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \delta^2} L(\delta) = -\delta^{-2} - x^2.$$

Therefore, (B5) holds with $G_2(x) = 1 + x^2$. Moreover, as we are studying Gaussian distributions, clearly (B6)-(B9) hold.

Suppose our data $\{X_{kt}\}$ are independently generated from $\mathcal{N}(\theta_k, \theta_k^2)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\eta_k, \eta_k^2)$, respec-

tively, when $t \leq n\tau_n$ and $t > n\tau_n$. Moreover, $\theta_k \neq \eta_k$ for at least one k and hence τ_n is the common change point. Let $\theta^{-1} = (\theta_1^{-1}, \theta_2^{-1}, \dots, \theta_m^{-1})$ and $\eta^{-1} = (\eta_1^{-1}, \eta_2^{-1}, \dots, \eta_m^{-1})$. By Theorem 3.1, if (SNR1) holds and $\log m(n) = o(n)$, then $n\|\theta^{-1} - \eta^{-1}\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n) = O_P(1)$. By Theorem 3.2(a), under (SNR1), $\log m(n) = o(n)$ and $\|\theta^{-1} - \eta^{-1}\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, $P(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} = \tau_n) \rightarrow 1$.

Note that $\frac{\partial^3}{\partial \delta^3} L(\delta) = 2\delta^{-3}$ and thus (B11) holds. Moreover, $I(\lambda) = -E \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \delta^2} L(\delta) = 3\delta^{-2}$. Suppose the following limit exists:

$$\sigma^2 = \lim \frac{3 \sum_{k=1}^m (\theta_k^{-1} - \eta_k^{-1})^2 \theta_k^2}{\|\theta^{-1} - \eta^{-1}\|_2^2}. \quad (6.22)$$

Hence, by Theorem 3.2(b), if (SNR1) holds and $\|\theta^{-1} - \eta^{-1}\|_2 \rightarrow 0$, then

$$n\|\theta^{-1} - \eta^{-1}\|_2^2(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau_n) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h).$$

Recall the set \mathcal{K}_0 and $\mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{K}_0^c$ in (2.4). Suppose the following limit exists:

$$\sigma_1^2 = \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} 3(\theta_k^{-1} - \eta_k^{-1})^2 \theta_k^2.$$

Suppose (A4), (B10) and (SNR1) hold, $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} |\theta_k^{-1} - \eta_k^{-1}|_2 \rightarrow 0$ and $\|\theta^{-1} - \eta^{-1}\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$, then

$$n(\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{MLE}} - \tau) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (D_2(h) + C_2(h) + A_2(h))$$

where for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_2(h+1) - D_2(h) &= -0.5\sigma_1^2, \quad C_2(h+1) - C_2(h) = \sigma_1^2 W_h, \quad W_h \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \\ A_2(h+1) - A_2(h) &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} (\log(\theta_k^*/\eta_k^*) + 0.5Z_{kh}^2(\theta_k^{*-2} - \eta_k^{*-2}) - Z_{kh}(\theta_k^{*-1} - \eta_k^{*-1})) \end{aligned}$$

and $\{Z_{kh}\}$ are independent with $Z_{kh} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}(\theta_k^*, \theta_k^{*2})I(h \leq 0) + \mathcal{N}(\eta_k^*, \eta_k^{*2})I(h > 0)$.

6.4 Supplement to Section 4.1: Adaptive inference for Gaussian time dependent data

We observe the data $\{X_{kt} : 1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq t \leq n\}$ which are independent over k but dependent over t . For all $t, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_l, l, k \geq 1$, suppose

$$X_{kt} = \tilde{Y}_{kt} + \mu_{1k}I(t \leq n\tau_n) + \mu_{2k}I(t > n\tau_n), \quad (6.23)$$

$$(Y_{kt_1}, Y_{kt_2}, \dots, Y_{kt_l}) \sim \mathcal{N}_l(0, ((\text{Cum}(Y_{kt_{l_i}}, Y_{kt_{l_j}})))_{l \times l}) \quad \text{and} \quad (6.24)$$

$$\sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} \sup_k |\text{Cum}(Y_{k1}, Y_{k(l+1)})| < \infty \quad (6.25)$$

where $\{Y_{kt}\}$ are not observable. Let,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_{1k} &= \frac{1}{n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}} \sum_{t=1}^{n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}} X_{kt}, \quad \hat{\mu}_{2k} = \frac{1}{n(1 - \hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}})} \sum_{t=n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}+1}^n X_{kt}, \\ \hat{C}_{k,l} &= \left(\frac{1}{n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}} - l} \sum_{t=1}^{n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}-l} X_{kt} X_{k(t+l)} \right) - \hat{\mu}_{1k}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

We generate $\{\tilde{Y}_{kt,\text{LSE}} : k, t \geq 1\}$ independently over $k \geq 1$ and for all $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_l, l \geq 1$,

$$(\tilde{Y}_{kt_1,\text{LSE}}, \tilde{Y}_{kt_2,\text{LSE}}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{kt_l,\text{LSE}}) \sim \mathcal{N}_l(0, ((\hat{C}_{k,|t_i-t_j|}))_{l \times l}). \quad (6.27)$$

Define $\tilde{X}_{kt,\text{LSE}} = \hat{\mu}_{1k}I(t \leq n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}) + \hat{\mu}_{2k}I(t > n\hat{\tau}_{n,\text{LSE}}) + \tilde{Y}_{kt,\text{LSE}} \quad \forall k, t \geq 1$. Recall $\tilde{M}_n(h)$ from (4.2). Let $\tilde{h}_{n,\text{LSE}} = \arg \max_h \tilde{M}_n(h)$. The following theorem states asymptotic distribution of $\tilde{h}_{n,\text{LSE}}$.

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose (6.23)-(6.25) hold. Then the following statements are true.*

(a) *Under (SNR1) and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow \infty$, $P(\tilde{h}_{n,\text{LSE}} = 0) \rightarrow 1$.*

(b) *Suppose (D4) and (SNR3) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Then*

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \tilde{h}_{n,\text{LSE}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{R}} (-0.5|h| + B_h^*) \quad (6.28)$$

where for all $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r \geq 1$,

$$(B_{h_1}^*, B_{h_2}^*, \dots, B_{h_r}^*) \sim \mathcal{N}_r(0, \Sigma) \quad \text{where} \quad \Sigma = ((\gamma_{(h_1, h_2), \text{DEP, MSE}}))_{1 \leq h_1, h_2 \leq r}. \quad (6.29)$$

. (c) Suppose (A4), (A7), (D5), (D6), (SNR3) hold and $\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2 \rightarrow c > 0$. Then

$$\tilde{h}_{n,LSE} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \arg \max_{h \in \mathbb{Z}} (D^*(h) + C^*(h) + A^*(h)) \quad (6.30)$$

where for each $h, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \geq 1$,

$$D^*(h) = -0.5c_1^2|h|, \quad C^*(h) = \sum_{t=0 \wedge h}^{0 \vee h} W_t^*, \quad (W_{t_1}^*, W_{t_2}^*, \dots, W_{t_r}^*) \sim \mathcal{N}_r(0, \Sigma^*),$$

$$\Sigma^* = ((\gamma_{(t_1, t_1), DEP, LSE}^*)), \quad A^*(h) = \sum_{t=0 \wedge h}^{0 \vee h} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_0} \left[(Y_{kt} + (\mu_{2k}^* - \mu_{1k}^*) \text{sign}(h))^2 - Y_{kt}^2 \right] \text{sign}(h).$$

Proof. This will go through the same arguments as given in Section 5.7, once we establish

$$(a) \quad \sum_{t_1=0 \wedge [h_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}]}^{0 \vee [h_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}]} \sum_{t_2=0 \wedge [h_2 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}]}^{0 \vee [h_2 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}]} \left(\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{C}_{k, t_1 - t_2} \right) \xrightarrow{P} \gamma_{(h_1, h_2), DEP, LSE},$$

$$(b) \quad \lim \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{C}_{k, t_1 - t_2} \xrightarrow{P} \gamma_{(t_1, t_2), DEP, LSE}^*.$$

for h_1, h_2 in a compact subset of \mathbb{R} . Here we shall show (a) only. (b) can be proved similarly.

Proof of (a). Consider $h_1, h_2 > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t_1=1}^{h_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}} \sum_{t_2=1}^{h_2 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{C}_{k, t_1 - t_2} \\ & \quad - \sum_{t_1=1}^{h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}} \sum_{t_2=1}^{h_2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2}) \\ = & \sum_{t_1=1}^{h_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}} \sum_{t_2=1}^{h_2 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 (\hat{C}_{k, t_1 - t_2} - E \hat{C}_{k, t_1 - t_2}) \\ & + \sum_{t_1=1}^{h_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}} \sum_{t_2=1}^{h_2 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}} \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 (E \hat{C}_{k, t_1 - t_2} - \text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2})) \\ & + \left[\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sum_{t=-h_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}}^{h_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}} \left(\frac{h_1}{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2} - t \right) \text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t+1)}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sum_{t=-h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2}^{h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2} \left(\frac{h_1}{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2} - t \right) \text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t+1)}) \right] \\ & + \left[\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sum_{t=-h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2}^{h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2} \left(\frac{h_1}{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2} - t \right) \text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t+1)}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sum_{t=-h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2}^{h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2} \left(\frac{h_1}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} - t \right) \text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t+1)}) \Big] \\
& + \left[\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sum_{t=-h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2}^{h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2} \left(\frac{h_1}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} - t \right) \text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t+1)}) \right] \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sum_{t=-h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2}^{h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2} \left(\frac{h_1}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} - t \right) \text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t+1)}) \Big] \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sum_{|t| > h_1 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}/2} \left(\frac{h_1}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} - t \right) \text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t+1)}). \\
& = T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4 + T_5 + T_6, \quad (\text{say}). \tag{6.31}
\end{aligned}$$

In Lemma 5.8, we have seen that $\frac{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} - 1 = o_P(1)$. Thus, by (6.25) and for some $C > 0$, $|T_4| + |T_5| \leq C \left(\frac{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} - 1 \right) = o_P(1)$. Also, for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$

$$|T_3| + |T_6| \leq C_1 \sum_{|t| > C_2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2}} \sup_k |\text{Cum}(X_{k1}, X_{k(t+1)})| + o_P(1) = o_P(1). \tag{6.32}$$

It is easy to see that for some $C > 0$, $\sup_k |E\hat{C}_{k,t_1-t_2} - \text{Cum}(X_{kt_1}, X_{kt_2})| \leq Cn^{-1}$. Therefore, for some $C > 0$, $|T_2| \leq C(n\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2)^{-1} = o_P(1)$. Also, for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$,

$$|T_1| \leq C_2 \sum_{t=-C_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}}^{C_1 \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^{-2}} |\hat{C}_{k,t} - E\hat{C}_{k,t}|.$$

Now, using the tail probability $P(|Z| > \epsilon) \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 \epsilon^2}$ for the standard normal variable Z and for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$, it is easy to see that $T_1 = o_P(1)$. Similarly idea works for $h_1, h_2 < 0$; $h_1 < 0, h_2 > 0$ and $h_1 > 0, h_2 < 0$. Hence (a) is established.

This completes the proof of Theorem 6.3. □

6.5 Proof of auxiliary lemmas

6.5.1 Proof of Lemma 5.2

Note that

$$E(N_{1k}^2(b)) = E \left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt})) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{(nb)^2} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) \leq \frac{1}{nb} \sup_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
E(N_{2k}^2(b)) &= E\left(\frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)^2 = \frac{1}{(n(1-b))^2} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \text{Var}(X_{kt}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sup_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}), \\
E(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) &= E\left(\frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)^2 = \frac{1}{(n(\tau-b))^2} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sup_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}), \\
E(N_{1k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &= \frac{1}{n\tau} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} E\left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right) \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n\tau} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) \leq \frac{1}{n\tau} \sup_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}), \\
E(N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &= \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} E\left[\left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^n (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right) \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) \leq \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sup_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{k,b} E(N_{1k}^2(b)) &\leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{2k}^2(b)) \leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_k E(N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-1}, \\
\sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{1k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) &\leq Cn^{-1}, \quad \sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq Cn^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since N_{4k} is non-random, we get $E(N_{4k}^2) = N_{4k}^2$. Moreover, since $N_{1k}(b)$, $N_{2k}(\tau)$ and $N_{3k}(b, \tau)$ are independently distributed, we have

$$\sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) = 0, \quad \sup_{k,b < \tau} E(N_{2k}(\tau)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) = 0.$$

Finally, since $E(N_{1k}(b)) = E(N_{2k}(b)) = E(N_{3k}(b, \tau)) = 0$ for all b , we get

$$\sup_{k,b} E(N_{1k}(b)N_{4k}) = 0, \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{2k}(b)N_{4k}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{k,b} E(N_{3k}(b, \tau)N_{4k}) = 0.$$

Hence, Lemma 5.2 is established. □

6.5.2 Proof of Lemma 5.3

Note that by (A1) and for some $C > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(N_{1k}^2(b)) &= E(N_{1k}^4(b)) - (E(N_{1k}^2(b)))^2 \\
&= E\left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)^4 - \left(\frac{1}{(nb)^2} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \text{Var}(X_{kt})\right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{(nb)^4} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{nb} E(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))^4 + 2 \left(\sum_{t=1}^{nb} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{k,t,n} E(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))^4 (nb)^{-3} + 2 \sup_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) (nb)^{-2} \\
&\leq Cn^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sup_{k,b} \text{Var}(N_{1k}^2(b)) \leq Cn^{-2}$. Similarly, $\sup_{k,b} \text{Var}(N_{2k}^2(b)) \leq Cn^{-2}$.

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) &= E(N_{3k}^4(b, \tau)) - (E(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)))^2 \\
&= E\left(\frac{1}{n(\tau-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} (X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))\right)^4 - \left(\frac{1}{(n(\tau-b))^2} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Var}(X_{kt})\right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{(n(\tau-b))^4} \left[\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} E(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))^4 + 2 \left(\sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \sup_{k,t,n} E(X_{kt} - E(X_{kt}))^4 (n(\tau-b))^{-3} + 2 \sup_{k,t,n} \text{Var}(X_{kt}) (n(\tau-b))^{-2} \\
&\leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{3k}^2(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-2}$. Similarly, $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{1k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-2}$ and $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{2k}(b)N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq C(n(\tau-b))^{-2}$. Moreover, as N_{4k} is non-random, $\text{Var}(N_{4k}^2) = 0$. Also by Lemma 5.2,

$$\text{Var}(N_{4k}N_{3k}(b, \tau)) = N_{4k}^2 E(N_{3k}(b, \tau))^2 \leq CN_{4k}^2 (n(\tau-b))^{-1}.$$

Therefore, $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{4k}N_{3k}(b, \tau)) \leq CN_{4k}^2 (n(\tau-b))^{-1}$. Similarly, $\sup_k \text{Var}(N_{4k}N_{2k}(b, \tau)) \leq CN_{4k}^2 n^{-1}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.3. \square

6.5.3 Proof of Lemma 5.7

Note that $L_{k,n}(b) - L_{k,n}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^4 A_{ik}(b) + \mathbb{M}_{7k}(b)$ where $\{\mathbb{M}_{7k}(b)\}$ and $\{A_{ik}(b)\}$ are taken respectively from Sections 5.5 and 5.6. To prove Lemma 5.7, it is enough to establish (a)-(d) given below.

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad & P(A_{1k}(b) \leq C\mathbb{M}_{1k}(b)) \rightarrow 1, \quad (b) \quad P(A_{2k}(b) \leq C\mathbb{M}_{2k}(b)) \rightarrow 1, \\ (c) \quad & P(A_{3k}(b) \leq C(\mathbb{M}_{3k}(b) + \mathbb{M}_{4k}(b))) \rightarrow 1, \quad (d) \quad P(A_{4k}(b) \leq C(\mathbb{M}_{5k}(b) + \mathbb{M}_{6k}(b))) \rightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we prove (a) and (c) only. The proof of (b) and (d) is similar.

We state two lemmas that are useful in proving (a) and (c). Their proofs are respectively given in Sections 6.5.4 and 6.5.5.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose (B3)-(B5), (B8), (B9) hold and $\log m(n) = o(n)$. Then, for all $b \in (c, 1 - c)$, we have $P(\hat{\theta}_k(b), \hat{\eta}_k(b) \in \Lambda \quad \forall k) \rightarrow 1$.*

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose $\{X_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\{Y_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ are two independent random samples from \mathbb{P}_a and \mathbb{P}_b for $a, b \in \Lambda$, respectively. Suppose (B4) and (B5) hold. Then, for some $0 < C_1 \leq C_2 < \infty$, $s_n = O(n)$ and large n ,*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < C_1 & \leq \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X_i) + \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(Y_i) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X_i) + \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(Y_i) \right| \leq C_2 < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now we are ready to prove (a) and (c).

Proof of (a). For some θ_k^* between $\hat{\theta}_k(b)$ and $\hat{\theta}_k(\tau)$ and some $C > 0$, we get $A_{1k}(b)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \left[(\hat{\theta}_k(\tau) - \hat{\theta}_k(b)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_k(b)} + (\hat{\theta}_k(\tau) - \hat{\theta}_k(b))^2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^*} \right] \\ & = b(\hat{\theta}_k(\tau) - \hat{\theta}_k(b))^2 \left[-\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^*} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.2, $P(\theta_k^* \in \Lambda) \rightarrow 1$ and hence by Lemma 6.3, there is $C > 0$ such that

$$P(A_{1k}(b) \leq C(\hat{\theta}_k(\tau) - \hat{\theta}_k(b))^2) \rightarrow 1.$$

Moreover, note that for some θ_k^* between $\hat{\theta}_k(b)$ and θ_k ,

$$0 = \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_k(b)} = \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) + (\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \theta_k) \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^*}$$

which implies

$$(\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \theta_k) = \frac{\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt})}{-\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^*}}.$$

Similarly, for some θ_k^{**} between $\hat{\theta}_k(\tau)$ and θ_k ,

$$(\hat{\theta}_k(\tau) - \theta_k) = \frac{\frac{1}{n\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt})}{-\frac{1}{n\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^{**}}}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \hat{\theta}_k(\tau))^2 &= \left[\frac{\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt})}{-\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^*}} - \frac{\frac{1}{n\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt})}{-\frac{1}{n\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\theta(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^{**}}} \right]^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{a_n^2 \wedge b_n^2} \left[\frac{1}{n\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) - \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right]^2 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$a_n^2 = \left(-\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^*} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad b_n^2 = \left(-\frac{1}{n\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^{**}} \right)^2.$$

Now by Lemma 6.2, $P(\theta_k^*, \theta_k^{**} \in \Lambda) \rightarrow 1$ and thus by Lemma 6.3, we have $C > 0$ such that $P(A_{1k}(b) \leq C\mathbb{M}_{1k}(b)) \rightarrow 1$. Hence (a) is proved.

Proof of (c). For some η_k^* and η_k^{**} between $\hat{\eta}_k(b)$ and η_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{3k}(b) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \left(\log \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\eta}_k(b)}(X_{kt}) - \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right) \\ &= \left(\hat{\eta}_k(b) - \eta_k \right) \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) + \left(\hat{\eta}_k(b) - \eta_k \right)^2 \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 \eta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\eta_k=\eta_k^*} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\left| \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|}{\left| \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta_k^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|_{\eta_k=\eta_k^{**}}} \left| \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right| \\
&\quad + \frac{\left| \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|^2}{\left| \frac{1}{n(1-b)} \sum_{t=nb+1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta_k^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|_{\eta_k=\eta_k^{**}}^2} \left| \sum_{t=nb+1}^{n\tau} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta_k^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\eta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|_{\eta_k=\eta_k^{**}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 6.2, η_k^* and η_k^{**} are in Λ with probability tending to 1 and hence by Lemma 6.3, there is $C > 0$ such that $P(A_{3k}(b) \leq C(\mathbb{M}_{3k}(b) + \mathbb{M}_{4k}(b))) \rightarrow 1$. Hence (c) is proved.

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.7. \square

6.5.4 Proof of Lemma 6.2

As θ and η are interior points of Λ , there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$(\theta - \epsilon, \theta + \epsilon), (\eta - \epsilon, \eta + \epsilon) \subset \Lambda. \quad (6.33)$$

To prove Lemma 6.2, it is enough to establish that for some $b \in (c, 1 - c)$,

$$P(|\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \theta_k| > \epsilon \text{ for some } k) \rightarrow 0, P(|\hat{\eta}_k(b) - \eta_k| > \epsilon \text{ for some } k) \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.34)$$

For some θ_k^* between $\hat{\theta}_k(b)$ and θ_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_k(b)} \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) + (\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \theta_k) \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^*}
\end{aligned} \quad (6.35)$$

which implies

$$|\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \theta_k| = \frac{\left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|}{\left| -\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta}(X_{kt}) \Big|_{\theta=\theta_k^*} \right|}. \quad (6.36)$$

Therefore by (B5), for some $C > 0$

$$|\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \theta_k| \leq C \left(\frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} G_2(X_{kt}) \right)^{-2} \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right|. \quad (6.37)$$

Chose $\delta < \inf_{k,t} E(G_2(X_{kt}))$. Hence, for some $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} G_2(X_{kt}) - EG_2(X_{k1}) \right| < \delta &\implies \left| \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} G_2(X_{kt}) \right| - EG_2(X_{k1}) \right| < \delta \\ \implies \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} G_2(X_{kt}) \right| &\geq \inf_{k,t} EG_2(X_{k1}) - \delta > C > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6.38)$$

Therefore by (B8), (B9) and $\log m(n) = o(n)$, and for some $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(|\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \theta_k| > \epsilon \text{ for some } k) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m P(|\hat{\theta}_k(b) - \theta_k| > \epsilon) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m P \left(\left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right| > C \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} G_2(X_{kt}) \right|, \left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} G_2(X_{kt}) - EG_2(X_{k1}) \right| < \delta \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^m P \left(\left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} G_2(X_{kt}) - EG_2(X_{k1}) \right| > \delta \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m P \left(\left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \log \mathbb{P}_{\theta_k}(X_{kt}) \right| > C_1 \right) + \sum_{k=1}^m P \left(\left| \frac{1}{nb} \sum_{t=1}^{nb} G_2(X_{kt}) - EG_2(X_{k1}) \right| > \delta \right) \\ &\leq C_2 m e^{-C_3 n} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.2. □

6.5.5 Proof of Lemma 6.3

By (B4) and (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &C_1 \left(\frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^n G_2(X_i) + \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} G_2(Y_i) \right) \\ &\leq \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X_i) + \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(Y_i) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(X_i) + \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda^2} \log \mathbb{P}_\lambda(Y_i) \right| \\ &\leq C_2 \left(\frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^n G_2(X_i) + \frac{1}{n + s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} G_2(Y_i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for some $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n+s} \sum_{i=1}^n G_2(X_i) &\xrightarrow{P} EG_2(X_1) \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{1}{n+s} \sum_{i=1}^s G_2(Y_i) &\xrightarrow{P} 0I(s_n = o(n)) + CEG_2(Y_1)I(s_n \neq o(n), s_n = O(n)). \end{aligned} \quad (6.39)$$

Thus, by (3.3), for large n

$$\epsilon_1/2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{n+s_n} \sum_{i=1}^n G_2(X_i) + \frac{1}{n+s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} G_2(Y_i) \right) \leq 3\epsilon_2. \quad (6.40)$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.3. \square

6.5.6 Proof of Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9

Suppose $\epsilon = C \frac{m}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^{-2} \sqrt{\log m}$ and $C > 0$. Since $\{X_{kt}\}$ are Sub-Gaussian, for some $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(\left| \frac{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} - 1 \right| > \epsilon \right) &= P \left(\left| \|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2 - \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \right| > \epsilon \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 \right) \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{k=1}^m P \left(\sup_{i=1,2} \sqrt{n} |\hat{\mu}_{ik} - \mu_{ik}| \geq C_2 \epsilon \sqrt{n} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 / m \right) \\ &\leq C_3 m \exp\{-C_2^2 n \epsilon^2 \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^4 / m^2\} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2}{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2} - 1 \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \sum_{k=1}^m |(\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 - (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2| = o_P(\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2). \quad (6.41)$$

Moreover, for some $C, C_1, C_2 > 0$ and $\epsilon = Cn^{-1} \log m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\sup_{k,i} |\hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 - \sigma_{ik}^2| > \epsilon) &\leq \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{k=1}^m \left[P(|\hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 + \hat{\mu}_{ik}^2 - \sigma_{ik}^2 - \mu_{ik}^2| > \epsilon/2) + P(|\hat{\mu}_{ik}^2 - \mu_{ik}^2| > \epsilon/2) \right] \\ &\leq C_1 m (e^{-C_2 n \epsilon} + e^{-C_2 n \sqrt{\epsilon}}) \leq 2C_1 m e^{-C_2 n \epsilon} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{k,i} |\hat{\sigma}_{ik}^2 - \sigma_{ik}^2| = o_P(1). \quad (6.42)$$

(6.42) implies Lemma 5.8 and the second part of Lemma 5.9(a).

Similarly as (6.42), one can show that

$$\sup_{k,t} |E((\tilde{X}_{kt} - E(\tilde{X}_{kt}|\{X_{kt}\}))^4|\{X_{kt}\}) - E(X_{kt} - EX_{kt})^4| = o_P(1),$$

which implies the first part of Lemma 5.9(a).

To prove Lemma 5.9(b), we shall show

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2} - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (6.43)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2} - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 (\hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2 - \sigma_{1k}^2)}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2} + \left(\frac{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2}{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2} \right) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2} \\ & \quad - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 (\hat{\sigma}_{1k}^2 - \sigma_{1k}^2)}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2} + \left(\frac{\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2}{\|\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2\|_2^2} - 1 \right) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2} \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\hat{\mu}_{1k} - \hat{\mu}_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2} - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2 \sigma_{1k}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m (\mu_{1k} - \mu_{2k})^2} \right) \\ &= o_P(1) + o_P(1)O_P(1) + o_P(1), \quad \text{by (6.41), (6.42) and (A1).} \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.9(b). Similar argument works for Lemma 5.9(c). Hence, Lemma 5.9 is established. \square